

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

---

JANUARY, 1848.

---

ART. I. — COQUEREL'S EXPERIMENTAL CHRISTIANITY.\*

It is a common opinion, and one which we regret to see so prevalent in our own country, that the French nation is a nation without religion, and even without religious aspirations. If any horrible crime is committed in France, there are hundreds to be found who will exclaim, What else could be expected in a country where there is no religion? These are grave imputations, and, as it seems to us, require some proofs to support them. That the French do not willingly accede to the present religion of France is a fact which we would not even wish to deny, for it is on this fact we found our belief that religious feeling is not extinct in that country. The time when Catholicism could exercise any real influence over the French people has passed away, never more to return. Catholicism is but nominally the religion of the majority of the French nation. Does it, however, follow, that in the hearts of those who have deserted the altars of the Church of Rome the pure flame of religion has become extinct? By no means. It is, indeed, impossible for man to eradicate from his breast that religious instinct which God himself has implanted within it. He may, for a time, seem no more to hear its voice, but he will sooner or later be again obliged to acknowledge its existence. So, too, a nation may, during a period of religious

---

\* *Le Christianisme Expérimental.* Par ATHANASE COQUEREL, l'un des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris. Paris. 1847. 12mo. pp. 527.

and social convulsion, no longer obey the dictates of this impulse, and abandon itself entirely to all the uncertainty and horror of skepticism and materialism. But when the revolutionary storm has subsided, when a nation has obtained that political or social freedom for which it struggled, it will feel, that, to enable man to bear the sorrows and disappointments which await him in this world, a cold and lifeless philosophical system is inadequate. It will then, once more, seek for an altar where it may offer up its prayers to God. This has been the case in France. Since that revolution, which was caused, perhaps, as much by the skepticism of the eighteenth century as by the vices of the Regent or of Louis XV., the French begin to feel the necessity of a religion in harmony with their real spiritual wants.

If this view of the present condition of France is not often taken, it is because we are apt to form our idea of the moral and social condition of a people from the extremes of society. This is unjust. It is not by what we see among a gay and heartless aristocracy, or in those classes that are plunged into the depths of misery, and of vice, the necessary companion of misery, that an opinion of this kind is to be formed. If such were the only means of judging of the morality of a people, how low would England stand in our estimation! It is from the condition of the middle classes, that is to say, the majority of the nation, that we must judge of the whole nation. If these classes are content with their imperfect form of worship, or if they are devoid of religious sentiment, then, and then only, may we despair of the future religious progress of a nation. If we look at the middle classes in France, we shall not, however, find any cause of despair. We shall there find many thousands of Catholics, who, were it not for that mysterious sympathy which binds every man to the faith of his fathers, and to that mode of worship which he was taught to profess when a child, would abandon their religion and become members of some Protestant church. We have ourselves known some who, although truly religious, never had taken the sacrament, because they were unwilling to conform to the usage of their Church preparatory to this ceremony, — unwilling to confess their sins to a sinner like themselves. We have known others, again, who did not believe in the Trinity, or who denied the infallibility of the Pope. And yet all these persons sincerely and honestly believed themselves Catholics. Tranquillize the conscientious anxi-



eties of such persons, convince them that it is not only not wrong to abandon a church to which one does not truly belong, but that it is the duty of every Christian to join the church whose doctrines are the most in harmony with his own, and they would soon be found, we doubt not, at the foot of some Protestant pulpit.

M. Coquerel's work is intended to present to these Christians, who have renounced the religion of the past, but who are still doubtful as to the path which they shall now follow, a complete religious system, which may serve as the foundation of their future faith. Firm and tranquil in his belief that France will one day be a Protestant country, M. Coquerel has devoted all his powers to the realization of this, his most ardent wish. The energies of a highly gifted mind, an impassioned and touching eloquence, and the treasures of a truly Christian heart, have been alike directed towards this great object. After thirty years of uninterrupted labor as a preacher, first in the French Protestant Church at Amsterdam, and afterwards as one of the pastors of the Reformed Church of Paris, he has at last published the work we have before us. M. Coquerel belongs to that class of Christians who think, that, as there were reformers before the Reformation, so too there may be reformers in every age; and that, however much we may be indebted to those immortal men who first freed the world from the yoke of Romanism, we may differ widely from them in their manner of interpreting the Scriptures. An intolerant Protestantism, that is to say, a religious system in which liberty of conscience is the first word but which ends with the solemn and horrible declaration, that there is only one Church in which man can be saved, is as unfit for our age as the Roman Catholic faith. A new system is, then, to be sought. In this system, faith in God as a Father, in Christ as a Saviour, and in immortality as the continuation of our present existence, must be included. But faith will not alone be required. We are confident that man will be judged, not according to his belief, if that belief be sincere, but according to his actions. And must it not be so? If every Protestant has a right to read his Bible, and therein to find his faith, how can it be expected that all men should believe alike? Who can suppose that the simple-hearted laborer, who on the Sabbath reads the Bible to his family, should understand it and interpret it as a Luther or a Calvin, a Chalmers or a Channing? No.

The time is fast approaching when there will be a large class of Christians, who, when asked to what religious denomination they belong, will simply reply, — We are disciples of Christ ; Christ has taught us to love God as a Father, to love each other, and to do by others as we would wish to be done by ; we are Christians, not theologians. And when, at last, the number of those who profess these liberal views shall have so increased as to spread all over the world, when all nations shall meet together to offer up prayers at the same altar, then, and then only, Christianity will have accomplished its object in this world. How beautiful is this anticipation of the future condition of the human race ! How soothing to the heart of the Christian, amidst the dissensions which now agitate mankind and divide them into innumerable sects, each of which is willing to assert that it alone is possessed of the truth !

There are many Christians, however, who may think that such a system savors too much of Rationalism. If they peruse M. Coquerel's volume, they will see, we think, that they are mistaken. They will see that the author, while he maintains our right to investigate, by the light of our reason, the various and difficult problems which surround us, at the same time shows that we shall necessarily, sooner or later, be stopped in our investigations, and be obliged to seek for another guide, or run the risk of remaining for ever in darkness and uncertainty. Such a system assigns to philosophy and to religion each its true place. Their respective positions have been often strangely misapprehended. They have been viewed, not as successive stages of the same science, but as rival methods of teaching the same truths. If this were the case, then either the one or the other would be useless. If with the light of our reason alone we could penetrate into the deepest recesses of our souls and solve the dark mysteries which envelope our existence, if philosophy could give a satisfactory answer to those questions which have perplexed the wisest, — What am I ? Whence come I ? Whither am I going ? — then might we not ask, To what purpose religion ? Might not Christ have remained in his glory on the right hand of the Father, instead of taking a human form and submitting to all the evils attendant on a human life ? Might he not have spared himself the sufferings of the most cruel of deaths ? A correct view of our own nature will show us that philosophy is but the introduction to religion, the vesti-

bule of the temple. Free to choose between good and evil, ignorance and knowledge, man may content himself with the imperfect and uncertain instructions of philosophy, or complete his knowledge by the aid of religion ; he may read the first volume of his history, and neglect the second ; he may pause in the vestibule of the temple as in a labyrinth, or take one step more, lift the veil which covers the sanctuary, and penetrate into the deepest mysteries of our being.

A work, founded on this distinction between philosophy and religion, must necessarily begin with a minute and careful examination of the nature, the faculties, and the desires of man. Let us endeavour to follow M. Coquerel in this research.

Man has the consciousness of his own existence, and of his individuality. He alone, of all the animals that inhabit this earth, has a clear and distinct notion of himself and of what surrounds him. From this conviction naturally result two facts, — that man has not always existed, and that the source whence his life has sprung is not within himself. Man knows that he has not always existed, because, as he has the consciousness of a present, he would, then, have also within himself the evidence of a past existence. He, moreover, knows that he did not create himself ; for if he had the power of creation, he would also have the power of maintaining his existence. On a further examination, man discovers within himself different powers or tendencies, which may be thus classed : — 1. the intellectual power, the object of which is knowledge ; 2. the moral power, the object of which is virtue ; 3. the affective power, which leads man to desire to form certain relations with his fellow-creatures ; 4. the feeling power, which tends to a complete satisfaction of man's desire, — to perfect happiness ; 5. the religious power, which induces man to seek for an object which he may adore.

The ideal notion of knowledge, of virtue, of love, of happiness, and of religion, which man has conceived in all stages of civilization, is but the object of these powers or tendencies. To deny that such an ideal exists is to declare that all the faculties, all the powers, of man are directed towards an unattainable object. This ideal does exist ; it is the object of our life ; it must be attained.

These few and simple observations on the nature and the desires of man at once destroy three of the most erroneous

philosophical systems which have ever existed in the world, — pantheism, pyrrhonism, and absolute spiritualism.

We know that we exist ; we feel our individuality. There is, then, something in nature which is not God. Pantheism is destroyed.

This consciousness of our existence is alike fatal to a system of absolute doubt ; since this one fact, at least, is indisputable and undisputed.

And, finally, a system of absolute spiritualism can no longer subsist ; for the knowledge we have of ourselves and of what is not us teaches us that matter exists.

From these considerations, man rises to a higher and purer conception, that of the existence of God. He feels that God exists ; for, if God did not exist, the religious tendency which he finds within himself would be without an object. God is the ideal of the mind. This ideal is one. God is one. How simple and how beautiful are these thoughts ! I am ; and because I am, God is. That which it is vain to seek to prove by a philosophical demonstration is made evident by the religious instinct we have within us, and is alike revealed to the greatest and the most humble minds. If God is one, every thing that is not God is created. Man, then, was created by God. The object of this creation is the complete satisfaction of all the powers and tendencies of man. Arrived at this degree of knowledge, we are stopped by an impenetrable mystery, that of our liberty. We cannot comprehend how God, who has created us and who watches over us, should have left us entire liberty to use as we like the faculties with which we have been endowed. To this mystery, as to all mysteries, there is no answer. We all believe in our liberty and at the same time in the omniscience of God ; but we cannot reconcile these two notions, which seem contradictory. To understand this mystery, it would be necessary to understand how God, when he had created the world, withdrew his almighty hand from his work. We are as much at a loss to comprehend how God leaves the heavenly bodies suspended in the universe, or how, after having formed the material world, he allows it to follow its laws, as to know how we can enjoy our liberty while God sees all that we are doing. The field in which this liberty is to be exercised is boundless, for the object of the powers of which we have recognized the existence within us is infinite. We can al-



ways approach nearer to God, or separate ourselves more from him. "What a distance," says our author, "between him to whom it was said, 'Where is thy brother Abel?' or him of whom the Saviour said, 'It had been good for that man if he had not been born,' and a Moses, with whom 'the Lord spake as a man speaketh unto his friend,' or a St. Paul, who desires to leave the world 'to be with Christ'! And yet neither of these examples shows the last degree of separation, or the most complete union, between God and man." An eternal life can alone suffice for man to fulfil his destiny and to approach the throne of God. However high he may have risen, he will still have to ascend. The angels are even "charged with folly" by God; the heavens themselves, that is, those who people them, "are not clean in his sight." Man is, then, immortal. If the object of all our faculties, of all our desires, is God, must we not be immortal? Would the narrow limits of a condition, which, whether after years or centuries, must end, be sufficient for the accomplishment of our destiny? No. The time can never come, when we shall possess sufficient science to authorize us to say, We know enough. The time can never come, when our religious aspirations will be so completely satisfied, that we shall feel ourselves near enough to God. The time can never come, when our affections will be so entirely gratified, that we can say, We have loved enough. We are immortal, and during the successive stages of our immortality we shall have the same consciousness of individuality that we have during our present existence. If we were to lose that consciousness, it would be matter of little or no importance to us whether we were immortal or not. The activity of man is uninterrupted. Thus generation after generation follow on that eternal road at the end of which is the Infinite.

"A new principle is an inexhaustible source of new views." This remark of a distinguished French philosopher\* is perfectly correct. If we take the principles which we have laid down as the basis of our philosophical and religious system, we shall view in a different light many of the most difficult and interesting problems of our destiny. We shall regard the notions of time and space, for example, as the necessary corollaries of these principles. Space is but the stage on which our activity is to be exercised; time, the successive

---

\* Vauvenargues, *Maxime* 211.

gradations through which we must pass, in order to make that progress which we all so ardently desire. The terrestrial paradise, that golden age of virtue and innocence, of which all nations have dreamed, is the time when we were fulfilling our destiny, when we were advancing towards God ; the fall of man, that fatal moment, when, instead of following the higher tendencies of his nature, he first trod that path which must lead him farther and farther from his Creator. From this change in the moral condition of man has resulted physical suffering. It is difficult to comprehend how so intimate a connection can exist between the moral and the physical world ; but it would be still more difficult to understand how a world, created for a pure and innocent being, could continue the same after the fall of that being.

Applied to each individual life, the principles we have established will throw much light on some points that now seem obscure. Thus, our birth will appear to us but as our first entrance upon that sphere of activity, which is the world we now inhabit ; life, but the length of time allotted us for our mortal task ; and death, but the moment when, throwing aside our mortal body, — as a traveller, fatigued and harassed by the length of his route, throws off his soiled and dusty garments when he has arrived at his home, — we shall take possession of the new and better organization which awaits us on the other side of the grave. The moment of our death is, then, the moment of our resurrection. Between our life and our immortality there is nothing, — nothing but that solemn moment, which to the unbeliever and to the bigot is so full of gloom, but which to the true Christian is only a moment of rejoicing and of thanksgiving, for to him that moment is but as the delivery of a soul from its prison-house. The declaration of Christ to the repentant malefactor, "*To-day* shalt thou be with me in paradise," may, then, be interpreted literally. And, finally, we shall better understand what is meant by the end of the world. What death is to an individual, the end of the world will be to the race. When all the resources of this earth shall have been exhausted, all its mysteries unravelled, all its beauties admired, it will become useless, and be cast aside as an instrument that can no longer be made serviceable. As to the moment when this final and solemn conclusion of the destinies of mankind in this world will take place, Christ himself has said, — " But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in

heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." But this we do know, that that moment need not be a subject of dark and gloomy forebodings. On the contrary, it will be an epoch of glory for mankind. It will be the last triumph of man in this world, his final deliverance from the shackles of matter.

This view of the nature of man, and the contradiction we find between his faculties and his present condition, naturally leads us to the thought, that he is not in the position for which he was created. None of his legitimate aspirations or desires are satisfied. With an ideal conception of what our faculties should attain, we are ever prevented from realizing this conception. The fable of Tantalus is the history of mankind. It is natural that we should seek a remedy for this evil. Thus for the first time, in this *experimental* system, the idea of a redemption is suggested. The object of a redemption must be to stop man in the course which is estranging him from his Creator, and to place him once more on the right path. Such a redemption, being intended for the whole human race, could not be produced by a secret agency working in the heart of each individual. It must be manifested in the person of a Saviour. The nature of the being who is to undertake so important a work must be of that kind which will enable him to hold communion with God, and at the same time to take a human form and live amongst men as one of them. If a Saviour had appeared in the world of so sublime and divine-like a nature as to fill his contemporaries with more of awe than of love, his mission would have been in vain. To show man the path which he is to tread, it is necessary that a Saviour should tread this path himself. He must go through all the different stages of a human life, he must die, he must rise from the dead. In all outward aspects he must belong to the country and to the age which are chosen for his mission. The moment selected for the appearance of a Saviour in the world seems at first to be a matter of little importance. It is not so, however. If man has the power to separate himself more and more from God, the time might come when he could no longer retrace his steps and tread once more the path which leads him towards his Maker. It was, then, necessary that the Redeemer of the world should appear at that precise moment when evil had reached its highest point of intensity. If he had come into the world before that moment, the liberty of man would not have been respected ; had he come after that mo-

ment, it would have been too late ; his mission would have been in vain.

At a certain period in the history of mankind such a Saviour was given to the world. That he was the Saviour is proved by the time of his coming, — at a moment when virtue and truth seemed alike banished from the world, when man had fallen so low that he did not even attempt to assert his rights as a member of the human race, but accepted his abject and degraded condition as a matter of course and without a murmur, — at a time when the gladiator consented to lay down his life in the bloody amphitheatre for the amusement of an indolent and corrupt assembly, — at a time, finally, when, in the midst of orgies of which history blushes to record the obscenity, the rich were wont to place on their tables an ivory skeleton, as a memento of the brevity of life, and when “ Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,” was a common and favorite maxim. Jesus Christ then appeared ; the world was arrested in its progress towards evil ; the *world was overcome*. Since then the progress of mankind has been constant on the road of peace, truth, and charity. There may have been, in the eighteen centuries which have elapsed since Christ came into the world, moments when mankind have seemed to retrograde, but no one can honestly deny that each successive age of the Christian era has been superior to the preceding.

That Jesus Christ was the Saviour is, moreover, proved by the place selected for his mission. Situated near the Mediterranean Sea, Palestine may be considered as the historical centre of the Old World. Originating in such a position, the new faith could the sooner spread to neighbouring countries. Had its birthplace been more remote from the Western world, the stationary and immovable habits of the Asiatic race might have stifled it in its blossom. If, on the contrary, its birthplace had been in Europe, there would have been danger, with the ardent and changeable character of the race which inhabits that continent, that the tradition of the coming of Christ would have been so disfigured and perverted by the time he did appear in the world, that he would not have been recognized, but have been received as a stranger. No nation was better qualified than the Jews to be the guardians of the promise of a Saviour. That it was necessary that the mission of Jesus Christ should be announced to the world scarcely needs to be proved. If it be true that the



redemption was a necessary complement of the creation, the notion of a Saviour must have existed ever since the fall of man. Hence, also, the notion of a revelation, that is to say, a book in which the coming of a Saviour is announced, and in which is contained the realization of this promise. A revelation must be in part divine, in part human. The divine part of a revelation is called inspiration. To the idea that parts of the Scriptures are inspired, it is objected by some that God in creating man must have given him faculties which would enable him to discover truths without any subsequent Divine intervention. Those who reason thus forget that man is not what God made him. If man had followed the path which might have led him nearer and nearer to his Creator, he would have required no assistance from above. The necessity of a redemption is the sole cause of this mysterious communication between God and man. Without sin, no redemption is requisite ; without a redemption, inspiration is unnecessary. Others object to inspiration on the ground that it is an inexplicable mystery. How presumptuous are those who reason thus ! Do they not see, that, in order to understand how God transmits his thoughts to man, it would be necessary to know how God thinks ?

There is another objection to inspiration, which, at first view, seems to be better founded. It has been asked, — What proof have we of the truth of inspiration ? It were indeed vain for a man to declare himself inspired, and to pretend to speak in the name of God, if he could give no proof of the veracity of his statement. An assertion so extraordinary requires some evidence. This evidence cannot be internal. A man may call himself inspired, and may believe himself so, and yet be a madman. Some external evidence is necessary. This evidence may be of two kinds. The truth of inspiration may be proved by a prophecy or by a miracle. The annunciation of coming events has been considered as a violation of human liberty. This is but another view of the great question of human liberty, and does in no way render the mystery greater. If God is God, that is to say, if he is an omniscient being, we must admit that none of our actions are hidden from him. If, then, at times, for some great purpose, he makes known to the world events which would otherwise remain hidden in the future, we cannot conceive that the liberty of man is more affected than if these events were not foretold. God knows that the Saviour has a false friend

who is about to betray him, and the Saviour himself announces the crime of Judas. We do not see in what way the liberty of Judas is more affected than if this event had not been announced.

The power of prophecy must of course be considered as a great proof of the truth of inspiration. But this proof is not sufficient. Such evidence can be conclusive only for those who live, not at the time when the prophecy is made, but at the moment when it is accomplished. The contemporaries of him who calls himself inspired must also have some proof of the veracity of this assertion. If he possesses the power of performing miracles, he will be believed. A miracle has commonly been defined to be a momentary suspension of the laws of nature. This definition is evidently erroneous. To declare that an event has taken place in virtue of a momentary suspension of the laws which govern the world, it would be necessary to know all these laws. Where is the man who would presume to pretend to so much knowledge? The views of our author on this important subject are as follows. As the object of the redemption of mankind was to lead the world back to the state it was in before the fall of man, it must have the power to revive for a time those forces which existed in the world prior to that event, and which since then have remained latent. A miracle, then, is simply the result of these forces brought into action by the regeneration of the world. Miracles thus become a necessary portion of a revelation. They not only prove what we have already said, that physical suffering was the result of moral evil; they moreover prove the efficacy of a redemption which has the power to revive the hidden forces of nature. But it may be objected to this theory, that some of the events which are related in the Scriptures as miraculous are in perfect harmony with the well known laws of our nature. This is true; but they are nevertheless miracles, because they occur by the order of some inspired man. A violent wind might blow and separate the waters of the Red Sea; but that this event should have happened at the order of Moses, so that the Israelites might pass through the sea, it is this that constitutes the miracle. No miracle occurs except on the order of one inspired; and the reason is obvious. If the miracle was in contradiction to the laws of nature with which we are acquainted, it would be considered as an extraordinary event, as a phenomenon; if, on the other hand,

it was in perfect harmony with the laws of nature of which we have a certain knowledge, it would pass unnoticed. In either case, it would be without use. By this theory it will be seen that M. Coquerel takes nothing from the importance of the miracles. He not only believes in their truth, but even denies that a redemption could have been effected without their aid. They form an important, an essential, part of revelation. They are the evidence of the right of the ancient prophets to announce the coming of the Saviour; they are, moreover, the guaranty of the truth of his mission.

Thus, by a natural and simple train of thought, we are led to the notion of a redemption, which we find realized in history with abundant proof. But were we left to our own reason, we should still be convinced of the truth of Christ's mission. Who, if it were not a fact, could have imagined a life so perfect as that of Jesus, under circumstances similar to those of every human life? Who could have imagined the Son of God, the Messiah, the Saviour of the world, under the humble garb of Jesus of Nazareth? The mind could undoubtedly have pictured to itself the ideal of human perfection; it could have clothed a being with all the attributes which it would desire for itself; but it could never have imagined the solemn, yet simple, scenes of the life of Christ, — his birth in a manger at Bethlehem, his pure and holy life, those scenes of his mortal career in which he showed himself so similar to us in all things excepting sin, his tears for the death of Lazarus, his joy at the success of the preaching of his disciples, his humble bearing towards his mother, his slow and painful death on the cross, his touching farewell to his mother and to the beloved disciple, and, finally, his glorious resurrection! No. Left to itself, the mind would have overdrawn the picture. An ideal Christ would have been either too distinct from, or too similar to, those amongst whom he was to live and die.

Now that we have arrived at the notion of a redemption, and find this notion has been realized in the world by the mission of Jesus Christ, let us examine, with our author, into the manner in which we ought to understand revelation. The first thought which presents itself here is, that the Christian religion, as revealed in the New Testament, has been commonly considered as mere instruction, as a theoretical collection of doctrines. To this view M. Coquerel objects. According to him, Christianity is something far better, far

more practical. It is a new and salutary impulse given to mankind. It addresses itself alike to all the faculties, to all the tendencies, of our nature. Had it been but a cold and lifeless system, like the philosophical systems of antiquity, it would have addressed itself to but one of these tendencies ; it would have addressed itself to the intellectual power alone. In other words, Christianity is not theology. He, who reads the Scriptures with a view merely to examine certain theological points, understands them not. He takes a part of religion for the whole. He considers it merely as a science, forgetting that the Saviour himself has said, — “ If ye *know* these things, happy are ye if ye *do* them.” In the Scriptures, instruction is never considered as an object, but solely as a means of attaining to a more spiritual life, and to a better knowledge of God. The method employed in the revelation is either to make truth visible by means of indisputable facts, or to present it as certain, or to state it as an axiom, or to leave it in so dim and vague a light that our reason cannot entirely understand it.

There are but few truths taught in the Scriptures by the first of these methods. The greatest of these is, unquestionably, the resurrection of Christ. In an age when the external appearances of death had hidden from the general eye the truth of the immortality of the soul, it was necessary to show by a fact that man rises from the dead the same as when he descends into the grave, — that is to say, that his identity is preserved, that he knows his friends, and that they know him.

All those truths, which are so intimately connected with the Infinite as not to be susceptible of demonstration, are considered as certain in the Scriptures. These truths are the attributes of God, our creation, our liberty, and Divine Providence. Here is another proof that revelation was not intended as a didactic work. The Scriptures are full of these truths ; they form the very basis of our religion ; and yet, throughout the Bible, there is no demonstration of them.

The truths which are considered as axioms are those which relate directly to our condition in this world. Not a word is to be found in the Scriptures on the organization of the family or of society, on personal freedom, political order, or many other questions which form the object of so much of our speculation. If the Gospels were the work of man, and not of God, they would be replete with theories on all these



subjects. How different is the work of God ! To all the errors which existed in the world with regard to these important questions at the time of the ministry of Christ, the Gospel opposes no argument, no vituperations. It does not attack despotism as the most flagrant violation of all human rights, or polygamy as the subversion of all morality. The only arms it uses against them are the fundamental principles, the spirit, of Christianity. "Our religion," says M. Coquerel, "is the first and only religion which has shown this astonishing confidence in the authority of truth, to take the world as it found it, without directly attacking any of its forces, to throw truth, as by chance, into the midst of it, like the invisible seed which is sown by the wind, and to predict that this seed will certainly take root and grow into that large tree under the shade of which mankind may take refuge against every error and every evil."

There are, finally, some truths which are left in so vague a light as to be incomprehensible to us in our present mode of existence. To the following questions, some of which have been the cause of so much strife in the Christian world, the Scriptures give no satisfactory reply : — What is the divine nature of Christ ? How are the soul and body united ? Does all communication cease between the living and the dead ? What will be the organization of man in another world ? What is the nature of angels and demons ? These questions remain unanswered, it is true, because in our present condition the solution of such problems is entirely unnecessary for our progress. We do not mean, however, to say that an examination of these curious and interesting problems must necessarily be dangerous. Philosophy and religion may alike speculate on them, provided they do not attempt to give to the results of their investigations an importance which they cannot really possess.

In this rapid sketch of the work under review, we have now arrived at a point where it becomes necessary to inquire into the future destinies of our religion. We must now endeavour to ascertain what are the triumphs reserved for Christianity both in this world and throughout eternity. The first thought that naturally strikes us in connection with this subject is, that Christianity is the final religion of mankind. Jesus Christ is the only Saviour who will ever be given to the world. We have two guaranties of this fact. First, the Christian religion is entirely independent of

every thing which surrounds it. It can exist in all places, in every climate, under all governments, and with every degree of civilization. How different in this respect from all false religions ! You may destroy the Sinai or the Calvary, Rome, Wittenberg, or Geneva, and efface them from the memory of man, — the Christian religion will still exist. If you destroy Jerusalem and its temple, the Jewish religion has no longer any meaning ; Christianity may plant its standard on any shore and in every soil. False religions are dependent even on the differences of climate which exist in different countries. The symbolism of the Egyptians cannot be conceived of elsewhere than on the borders of the Nile, that of the Indians but in the valley of the Ganges or the Indus ; the mythology of Greece belongs to the warm and genial climate of that lovely land, that of Odin to the cold and frosty climate of the North. Thus independent of every thing external, Christianity must be the final religion of mankind.

The second guaranty which we have that Christianity is the final religion of mankind is still more conclusive. It addresses itself alike to all our powers, to all our tendencies. To the intellectual power it promises infinite knowledge ; from the moral power it demands perfection ; from the affections it demands love without end towards God and a similar love for our fellow-men. St. John says, — “ He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen ? ” To the tendency toward happiness our religion promises eternal felicity ; and, finally, Christianity satisfies our religious tendency in showing us that our union with God may become more and more perfect. A religion which thus takes hold of man by all his faculties must be the final religion of mankind. A new religion would find nothing new to teach.

The influence of Christianity has been as yet of two kinds. It has had a direct influence on those who profess it, and an indirect influence on those who do not believe in its doctrines, or who are ignorant even of its existence. All the progress made in the world for the last eighteen centuries may be ascribed to it. But this indirect influence is not sufficient. If Christianity is the final religion of mankind, the time must come when all men will profess its doctrines. This time will come. But before our religion can become the universal religion of the human race, it must

undergo different changes or modifications, which our author classes under the following heads.

First, Christianity must be freed from all ecclesiastical rules. The moral and religious laws which are given in the Scriptures are general, and never enter into minute details of conduct. The application of the law is left to each individual. The liberty of man is thus respected. In the Gospels, we do not even find any forms of prayer or of public worship prescribed; any rules as to the rites of marriage or the duties of a married life, to death or mourning for the dead. Man, and man alone, has attempted to prescribe a certain number of rules, which cannot with impunity be transgressed. Such a course is in direct opposition to the spirit of Christianity. It is, moreover, absurd and impracticable. In endeavouring to write down rules of conduct which man must follow, who can pretend not to forget a single article? Happy would it be, however, for Christianity, if the sins committed in these dangerous attempts were only sins of omission.\* It is a cheering sight to the Christian, to observe that many Catholics of the present day prefer to seek in their own conscience for the approbation or condemnation of their actions, rather than from their confessor. Christianity must, and will ultimately, be entirely freed from this pernicious system.

Christianity must, in the second place, be freed from all clerical hierarchy. It is evident that the distinction of the layman from the priest is not as old as our religion. Thus, for example, the administering of the sacrament was, in the early ages, a family rite. The father of the family was in the habit of breaking the bread and distributing it to his children. Whether the time will come or not when Christianity can entirely dispense with all outward forms of worship, and consequently with a clergy to celebrate that worship, is a question which we cannot solve. The progress which our religion must make in this respect will tend to destroy all clerical hierarchy, to make all the ministers of God equal. This progress has been attained in many Protestant churches. It will finally be universal.

---

\* M. Coquerel published a few years ago an admirable letter to the Archbishop of Lyons, on the subject of a work published in his diocese entitled, — "*Collationes practicæ* of the Seminary of St. Flour," — a work in which are recorded crimes and abominations which one would rather expect to find in the Epigrams of Martial than in the productions of a priest.

Christianity must, thirdly, be set free from all authority, no matter under what name it shows itself. No man and no body of men has a right to step between God and the Christian. All obligatory professions of faith will be abolished.

Our religion must also be delivered from all exaggeration in respect to the importance of outward forms. The principle, that God is spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, and that it matters little what are the forms of this worship, must be universally adopted. A truly Christian spirit may be hidden under the most absurd and vain ceremonies.

Christianity must likewise be delivered from all superstitious views as to the literal interpretation of the Scriptures.

Our religion must, finally, be freed from the belief, that faith in a certain dogmatic interpretation of the Scriptures is necessary to salvation. Much progress has already been made in this respect. Christian communities are already beginning to be convinced that a man may be truly Christian, although his interpretation of the Scriptures be entirely opposed to their own. The conscience of the Christian world is indignant, when, in our own times, a bull is issued from the pontifical throne of Rome, declaring that moral virtue is of no value in the sight of God, or when such men as Newton, Clarke, and Locke are declared to be bad Christians because they did not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. When the whole world shall have been convinced that there is but one faith necessary to salvation, that which each man has formed for himself by the sincere and conscientious study of revelation, then the final triumphs of Christianity in this world will be at hand. For the last eighteen centuries man has sought in vain for peace and harmony in a complete unity of doctrine and of faith. Let him seek for this peace in the unity of all Christian hearts, and his search will not be vain.

Such are the changes through which Christianity must pass before it can become the universal religion of mankind. If we now ask what changes our religion must undergo before it can become the religion of eternity, the idea will naturally present itself, that Christianity must be freed from the notions of time and space. If we view our religion in this new light, we shall naturally be led to consider heaven and hell, not as two distinct places, in which the just are rewarded and the sinner is punished, but as two different dispositions of the



mind. In a future existence, we shall be what we have made ourselves. If we have used our faculties to approach God, we shall be recompensed by the approbation of our conscience ; if we have used them, on the contrary, to separate ourselves from him, we shall suffer all the pangs of an evil conscience. The question here presents itself, whether these sufferings will be eternal, whether there is no hope of a final reconciliation between God and all his children. The answer to such questions is simple. It is possible for man eternally to misuse his faculties. We have already said that the road which leads him away from God is as infinite as the road which leads him towards his Heavenly Father. Man may, then, eternally suffer, because he may eternally do wrong. But, because this possibility exists, ought we to believe that it will ever be realized ? Is it not more in harmony with the consoling instructions of our religion, to believe that the time will come when God will be all in all ? We have, indeed, in the nature of man, almost a certain guaranty that he will not be eternally miserable. If he retain the consciousness of his actions in another life, he will know that he has sinned, and that therefore he suffers. Is it not natural, then, to suppose that he will seek to rise from his state of degradation and to join those heavenly legions who are on the road of progress ? We confidently believe that the time will come when all beings will form but one great family. We cannot but pity those who wilfully deny themselves so beautiful and consoling an expectation, and who believe that an eternity of suffering awaits every sinner. But, alas ! what shall we say of those who believe that all who do not profess the same creed with themselves will be irretrievably lost ? We turn from such a deplorable aberration of the human mind, and thank God that we do not believe in so horrible a doctrine. We can cast our eyes over the whole extent of this world and contemplate the beings who people it, without fearing to meet the eye of one — yes, not even of one — sentenced to so hard a doom.

We have endeavoured, in the preceding pages, to trace, as rapidly as possible, the principal features of M. Coquerel's remarkable work. It will be seen that he examines frankly and thoroughly all the problems which our religion suggests. Whether we accept his conclusions or not, the position which he holds in France and the influence which he exerts entitle his opinions to consideration, especially when deliber-

ately expressed with a reference to the present interests of society and religion. To say how soon the pure Christianity of which he has given the outline in this book will be popular in France is beyond the reach of human foresight. In a country which is comparatively new to so pure a faith, it can hardly be expected that it should be immediately adopted. But the time will certainly come, when the French, as all other nations, will relinquish the superstitious errors of the past and adopt a Christianity founded on a broader and more liberal basis. Our unshaken confidence in the truth of our religion, and in the purity of the form of Christianity which we profess, renders us firm in our belief that the time will certainly come, when all Christians will agree, not on theological points, which will ever remain open to discussion, but on all subjects essential to their progress in this world and throughout the different stages of their future existence. The time will come, when the spiritual power of the pope will no longer be felt in its influence on mankind ; perhaps the activity which has rendered Pius IX. so popular is but a display of that preternatural strength which not unfrequently announces an approaching dissolution. The time will come, when the confessions of faith of La Rochelle and of Augsburg, or the contradictory articles adopted by the Church of England, will no longer be considered as binding. And all these changes will occur without much struggle. The churches now dedicated to the Roman Catholic worship will be converted into Protestant temples ; they will not be destroyed. The tapers which burn on the altars, as if the light of the sun were not a light sufficient for the worship of God, will be extinguished ; the works of art which adorn them will be transported to some museum ; the confessional will be removed ; the priest in his rich and varied dresses will no longer officiate at an altar stripped of all its splendor ; incense will no longer rise to the Gothic roof ; but multitudes will still throng the church to hear the word of God read and explained.

We could wish, for M. Coquerel's sake, that he might live to witness these tranquil triumphs of Christianity over the errors of the past. Few men, indeed, have done more towards hastening the religious progress of their country than he. Those who are acquainted with his life know how much courage it has required to hold his ground in the Reformed Church of Paris. Surrounded by clergymen who believe in the creed of St. Athanasius, and in the impossibility of salva-

tion for those who do not accept that masterpiece of human ingenuity, he has been constantly attacked by his colleagues in the most bitter manner. To these invectives he has replied with firmness, but without overstepping the limits of Christian charity. Peace and unity in the Church have been the constant theme of his eloquent preaching. We remember to have heard him on one occasion, after having exhorted his hearers to maintain peace with those of their brethren whose doctrinal views differed from their own, exclaim : — “ Do you not hear the sound of those who are waiting at the doors of this church to be admitted to commune with you ? O, no ! You hear them not. The noise of our vain and sterile disputes has buried their voice ! ” May his perseverance and his courage be recompensed ! When at the hour of his death he shall look around him and does not see the seed which he has sown bursting forth into a rich and fertile harvest, he will console himself with the thought that he has done his duty, and that God will do the rest. He will remember that St. Paul has said : — “ I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase.” R. W.

---

ART. II. — DOCTRINAL INSTRUCTION IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS.\*

“ SHOULD the doctrines of Christianity be systematically taught in our Sunday schools ? ” was a question proposed by the Secretary of the Sunday School Society to several correspondents, while preparing his Annual Report. It is discussed in the latter part of that Report, as fully as its proper limits would permit. We deem it a very important question, and one which demands, at this particular time, the careful consideration of every friend of pure Christianity. We say, “ at this particular time,” because we fear that there is in many minds a strange aversion to the whole subject of doctrinal discussion or instruction, both in the pulpit and in the Sunday school. The older members of our most

---

\* *The Nineteenth Annual Report of the Sunday School Society, with an Account of the Proceedings at the Public Annual Meeting, 26th of May, 1847.* Boston : S. G. Simpkins. 1847. 12mo. pp. 24.

firmly established religious societies, who were interested in the controversy upon Christian doctrines which took place between the Unitarians and their opponents some years ago, acquired clear and distinct views of the doctrines of Christianity as held by Unitarians, in distinction from the doctrines of other denominations, of the arguments by which they are supported, and of the way in which objections to them are answered. But, at the same time, they became wearied with the process, and disgusted, perhaps, with the unchristian bitterness that too often accompanies controversy, if it be not generated by it. And the natural consequence has been an aversion, in many of our older societies, to distinct doctrinal discussion, or direct and systematic efforts to teach the doctrines which are embraced. It is much to be feared, therefore, that the younger portion of such societies are growing up without any well settled and distinctly defined opinions, liable, in after life, to be "driven about by every wind of doctrine" to which they may be exposed. And there is great danger, also, that, from the want of clear and distinct views upon the doctrines of Christianity, their religious principles will become weak or unsettled, and they will be driven by difficulties or allured by temptations from the path of moral virtue and Christian holiness. We thank the Secretary of the Sunday School Society for having called the attention of the community to this question, "Should the doctrines of Christianity be systematically taught in our Sunday schools?"

The question takes it for granted that there are certain "doctrines of Christianity." And this the members of every Christian denomination sincerely believe. They may differ widely upon the question as to what these doctrines are; but they all believe that Christianity is not without its own distinct and peculiar doctrines, — that Jesus Christ and his Apostles in teaching Christianity did teach these doctrines. But what place, we very naturally ask, did they assign them in their teaching? Did they teach doctrines as matters of importance, as essential parts of Christianity, or as mere incidental appendages, which might be attached to the system or separated from it, without, in either case, seriously affecting its character or its practical influence? It seems to us that the doctrines of Christianity were taught by our Saviour and his Apostles as essential parts of the religion, — without which it would not be what it now is. We can



form no conception of a Christianity entirely divested of all the doctrines which our Saviour and his Apostles taught. It is from these peculiar doctrines that it derives in part its peculiar character. If, then, we would teach Christianity in our Sunday schools, we must teach its doctrines, because they constitute some of its essential parts, and serve, in some measure, to give it its peculiar character.

May not the aspect of this question be somewhat changed by a simple change of terms? Suppose that, in our question, we substitute the term *truths* for the term *doctrines*. It would then read, "Should the truths of Christianity be systematically taught in our Sunday schools?" And does not the question, in this form, convey precisely the same meaning intended in its original form? But can there be found those who will advocate the negative of the question in this form, — the teaching of Christianity without its truths? What is the object of Sunday school instruction? Is it not to make our children acquainted with Christianity, to give them a clear mental conception of what it is, in its truths, principles, precepts, and spirit, that so their knowledge of Christianity may become to them the means of making them true and devoted Christians? It must be ever borne in mind, that our children will carry out from our Sunday schools precisely that knowledge of Christianity which is there taught them. If we teach only select portions of the Gospel, then will they carry forth with them into life only a partial knowledge of religion. And not only so, but there will be great danger, that, from the very circumstance of their being so instructed, they will imbibe either a strong prejudice against seeking an acquaintance with other portions of the Gospel system or a feeling of utter indifference in regard to them. Are there any friends to the best influences of Christianity, who would be willing to have our children, as they become men and women, carry out into the world with them, as their guide in duty, their strength in temptation, their support in trial, a Christianity in which are incorporated none of the doctrines of Christianity, — in other words, none of the truths of Christianity? And even if this should be attempted, would the system taught be the Christianity of Christ and his Apostles?

We are aware that there are many who object to teaching doctrines in our Sunday schools. "What we wish," say they, "is, that our children should be there trained to the ex-

ercise of right feelings and the formation of right principles, — truly Christian feelings and principles. If this result be secured, it matters not whether they are made familiar with the doctrines of Christianity or not.” But how, it may be asked, are we to awaken right feelings? We wish our children to be filled with love to God. How are we to awaken this love? Must it not be by teaching them something, some truths, some doctrines, in regard to the existence and character of the God we wish them to love? If our children have no distinct conceptions of the existence or character of God, can they be filled with love to him? Or if God be represented to them in a hateful light, as a cruel, arbitrary, and vindictive being, will they delight to think of him, will they cherish a trusting, confiding, filial love to him? The feelings, then, which our children may cherish in regard to God will depend, not only upon their being taught some doctrines or truths respecting him, but, in a very great degree, upon the character of the representations that are made of the truths that are taught respecting God.

Again, if we wish to cherish and cultivate in our children deep, heartfelt, all-embracing love to man, how are we to awaken this love? When we look upon the debased and the degraded, upon the savage and the barbarous among men, is there any thing in their obvious appearance to awaken in our hearts deep sentiments of love to them? The love of men, which we wish to cherish in the hearts of our children, is founded, not upon the obvious appearances presented, as we take a cursory glance at the world, but upon Christian doctrines or truths in regard to man as a spiritual being, capable of spiritual elevation, purity, and holiness, — as a child of God, — as our own brother. With these truths clearly defined and distinctly embraced, we can cherish love, Christian love, for the most debased, abandoned, and wretched of our fellow-men, because with the eye of faith we can look beneath all this wretchedness and degradation, and discover a spiritual nature created for high and holy employments, and capable, if the power of the Gospel can be brought to bear upon it, of being, even yet, emancipated from its bondage to sin, and elevated to heavenly holiness and happiness. But this love grows out of, and is founded upon, the doctrines or truths taught by Christianity concerning man. If, then, we would, in our Sunday schools, truly awaken love to man in the hearts

of our children, — love which shall be all-embracing in its reach, and self-sacrificing in its efforts for man's elevation and improvement, — we must teach them the doctrines or truths of Christianity in regard to man. And so it is with all the various feelings and emotions which we wish to nourish in the hearts of our children. They grow out of, and are founded upon, certain doctrines or truths of Christianity.

And as to right principles, will not the same position hold true? Are not these also founded on Christian truths or doctrines? We wish, for example, to send the children who are now pupils in our Sunday schools out into the world with such principles deeply implanted in their hearts as will prevent their ever departing, in their future transactions of business, from the line of strict rectitude, and with such principles as will prevent them, in their future political efforts, from indulging unchristian feelings, or pursuing unchristian courses. How shall we do this? On what shall we erect these principles? We must teach our children something more than merely that honesty is the best policy. We must teach them the doctrines or truths of Christianity in regard to God's constant presence with them and constant moral inspection over them, and in regard to their accountability to God. We must teach them the doctrines or truths of Christianity in regard to their own spiritual natures, and the danger there is of polluting, debasing, degrading their own souls by indulgence in wrong-doing. We must teach them the doctrines or truths of Christianity in regard to the indissoluble and eternal connection established by the laws of God's spiritual kingdom, and inwrought into the very texture and constitution of our spiritual natures, between sin and misery, between holiness and happiness. On these great and important doctrines, distinctly comprehended and firmly believed, may rest, as upon a sure foundation, the principle of unswerving devotion to right and duty, amid all the temptations and allurements, all the trials and disappointments, of life. But, unless these and other appropriate truths are taught, on what can we build any well-grounded hope that our pupils will carry with them into their future mercantile or political life principles which will prevent them from departing, in a season of trial or an hour of temptation, from the line of strict rectitude and Christian integrity?

We might refer to other principles. But we have said enough to illustrate our position on this point. We sincerely

believe, then, that children cannot be trained up in the best exercise of true Christian feelings, or to the complete establishment of Christian principles in their hearts, unless they are taught the truths or doctrines of Christianity, as the fountain that is to sustain the constant flow of these feelings, the basis on which these principles may permanently rest. We should, then, teach doctrines in our Sunday schools, in order to cherish true Christian feelings and implant true Christian principles in the hearts of those who are there taught.

We are inclined to believe that many minds have been confused upon this subject, by the fact that there are different opinions held, in regard to the doctrines of Christianity, by different denominations of Christians. Some seem unwilling to teach what they themselves honestly believe to be the true doctrines of Christianity, lest by so doing they should seem to teach, by implication at least, that others who may differ from them are in error. In order to free the mind from all confusion arising from this cause, let us imagine a different state of things. Suppose, then, that there was no difference of opinion upon the doctrines of Christianity, and that there never had been, but that, from the time of our Saviour to the present day, the Christian Church had, with one voice, held precisely the same views of Christian doctrine which we now hold. If, under such circumstances, the question were proposed, whether it were proper to teach the doctrines of Christianity systematically, what would be the answer? Would not every one feel that it would be a fatal omission, should we neglect to communicate to our children those doctrines or truths which were to us the fountain of spiritual life, the source of religious strength, and the justification of our hopes of everlasting bliss beyond the grave? And will the fact, that there are those who do not believe the doctrines which we have embraced, change the grounds of our duty? There are those who reject Christianity entirely, and regard it as wholly an imposition upon the credulity of mankind; shall we, on that account, neglect to instruct our children in Christianity at all? Will our obligations to our children be in the least degree weakened or altered by the fact that others doubt and disbelieve? And will not the same principle hold good in regard to what we believe to be the true doctrines of Christianity? Shall we neglect to teach these to our children, when we honestly believe them to be the true doctrines of the Gospel, simply because others reject them as untrue? Our obligations in



this respect rest not upon the unanimity of the opinions of the community, but upon the firmness and the honesty of our own convictions of the truth and importance of what we would teach.

But it may be said, that we have not as yet touched upon the point at issue, that all will agree to what we have thus far advanced, relating, as it obviously does, to those great, general truths in which all, or nearly all, Christian denominations are united. And the question may be asked, "Would you teach the disputed doctrines in their controversial aspects in our Sunday schools?" To this question we should give a distinct and emphatic affirmative answer. Are we asked for our reasons? We answer, that we do not understand how the New Testament, how the declarations of Jesus, can be thoroughly taught, without doing this. Suppose that we are carrying a class of the older pupils of the school through the New Testament, and we come to the declaration of our Saviour, "I and my Father are one," what shall we do? Shall we say to our pupils, — "That is a passage upon the right interpretation and proper application of which Christians are divided in opinion, and therefore we shall leave it without explanation"? And shall we adopt the same course in regard to all passages upon the interpretation of which there is a difference of opinion among Christians? If so, will not our instructions upon the New Testament be broken and incoherent, superficial and inefficient? Or shall we take a different course, and simply give the explanation which we may regard as the true one, without informing the pupils that there are among Christians other and different opinions in regard to the true meaning of the passage? And shall we in this way be dealing fairly and honestly with the minds of our pupils? They are receiving our instruction as the truth; or, at least, they will naturally infer, if we do not state that there are differences of opinion, that we mean to leave the impression that no such differences exist. They will not understand us as giving them merely our opinion of the meaning of the passage, with the full knowledge, on our part, that it is an opinion in regard to which many wise and good men differ from us. And when in after life those pupils learn that we have passed off upon their confiding minds as the truth what we knew at the time to be only one opinion among several, of the existence of which we did not inform them, will they not have reason to feel that they have not been fairly dealt with?

It seems to us, then, that the proper course would be, when, in giving instruction upon the New Testament to the older pupils in our Sunday schools, we come to passages in regard to which there are differences of opinion, to inform the class that there are such differences, to state the different opinions that are held, together with the reasons or arguments upon which they severally rest, and then explain the reasons why we have adopted the one we would recommend, and why we have rejected the others. In pursuing this course, we should feel that we had dealt fairly with the minds of our pupils, and had placed our interpretation of a disputed passage before their minds in its true light, simply as our opinion, founded upon reasons satisfactory to us. Nor do we understand how we can honestly and thoroughly give instruction upon the New Testament, without in this way teaching the disputed doctrines of Christianity, even in their controversial aspects.

But, again, we would teach the disputed doctrines of Christianity in their controversial aspects, in order to give our children clear views of the truths or doctrines they may embrace, together with the grounds on which a belief in them may rest, and so prevent their becoming bigoted sectarians. We have generally observed, that, among all denominations, other things being equal, the more clear and definite a man's ideas may be of the doctrines he professes to embrace, of the arguments by which they are supported, and of the objections usually alleged against them, together with the way in which these objections may be met and answered, the more truly charitable will he be in his feelings towards those who may differ from him in opinion. And is it not perfectly natural, that the more fully a person has investigated the doctrines which he professes to embrace, the reasons for them, and the objections against them, the more clearly he will be able to perceive that others may be just as honest as himself, and yet embrace opinions different from his own? In order, then, to impart to the rising generation a clear understanding of the doctrines they may embrace, and prevent their becoming in later life narrow-minded and bigoted sectarians, and in order to lay the foundation for their being truly liberal and charitable, even in their attachment to their own opinions, towards those who may differ from them, we would have them taught carefully and systematically the doctrines of Christianity, together with the arguments by which they are supported, the objections alleged against them, and the way in which those objections may be met and answered.

Still further, we have watched carefully the characters and the courses of those who have changed their religious opinions and their denominational relations, and we have observed that they may be divided into two classes. There are those who have from some outward influence connected themselves with Unitarian societies, and have perhaps honestly thought themselves Unitarians in their belief. But they have not fully understood the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, in all the depth and extent of their spiritual meaning, in all their positive aspects and practical applications. Neither have they made themselves acquainted with the arguments by which these doctrines are supported, nor with the way in which objections to them are to be met and answered. Such sometimes become excited upon the subject of religion, and are led, under the influence of strong religious feelings, to change their denominational relations. We do not say change their religious opinions; for the truth is, they never clearly understood the doctrines of the denomination they have left, and they seldom take the pains to understand those of the denomination with which they connect themselves. They are influenced more by feeling and impulse than by argument, and what, in either case, they dignify with the name of opinions, might with more propriety be called prejudices. But these are the very persons who, upon changing their denominational relations, are most apt to become extremely bitter in their denunciation of the doctrines embraced by the denomination they have left. There are others, however, who have understood the doctrines they have professed to embrace, have sought to regulate their conduct by a regard to them, and have for a time enjoyed much in the religious strength and Christian peace derived from them, but who have afterwards, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, changed their religious belief and their denominational relations. But such are usually liberal in their feelings towards the denomination they have left, and candid in their judgment of the opinions they have renounced. It is not, then, because we have any wish to bind down our children to our own views, that we would have them taught in their early years what we believe to be the true doctrines of Christianity. It is because, in the first place, we would endeavour by such instruction to prepare them for becoming intelligent and candid Unitarians, should they spend their lives in connection with the Unitarian denomination, and because, in the second

place, we would seek in this way to prepare them for examining carefully and candidly the arguments which may be alleged in support of any system of doctrines that may be presented to their notice, and would have them so trained, that, if they shall ever renounce Unitarianism, they may do it understandingly, with a full knowledge of the doctrines they renounce, and of their reasons for renouncing them, — of the doctrines they embrace, and of the reasons why they embrace them. And we should expect, as the result of such a course of Sunday school instruction, that our young people, whether they should adhere to Unitarianism or renounce it, would always be found intelligent, candid, and liberal members of the denomination with which they might at any time be connected.

But there are those who doubt the propriety of giving distinct and definite instruction upon the doctrines of Christianity in our Sunday schools, on the ground that it is an infringement of the child's right to form his own opinion unbiased by the prejudices of early education, when in after-life he may examine the subject for himself. "We," say they, "have formed our own opinions for ourselves. Our children ought to enjoy the same privilege. We have no right to take advantage of our age and superiority, nor yet of our parental relation, to impose upon them our opinions, which with us are the result of examination and conviction, but which with them must necessarily be the mere prejudices of education." But it may be asked, if it be possible to train up our children, either in the family or in the Sunday school, in such a manner that they shall be entirely free from prejudice upon this subject. Children are not, by any means, entirely indebted to direct instruction for the prejudices they imbibe. Many early prejudices are derived from incidental influences. The simple circumstance, that we, as parents, Sunday school teachers, or members of the community, embrace one class of opinions rather than another, or worship with one denomination rather than with another, will prejudice our children, if they have any respect for our characters, in favor of the doctrines or the denomination to which we have given our adherence. But their opinions, so called, will be mere prejudices, resting only on their respect for the characters and practices of those who are older than themselves. If they go out into the world nominally Unitarians, it will be only because their fathers, or the community in which they were ed-



uated, have been so, and not because they understand and approve the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity. To prevent this, if possible, we would have them instructed, before they leave the Sunday school, distinctly and systematically in the doctrines of Christianity, that so their previous prejudices may become well-settled convictions, resting upon their own clear understanding of the arguments and reasons adduced in their support. If, then, it is impossible so to train our children that they shall be entirely free from prejudices upon this subject of Christian doctrines, is it not the part of wisdom and of love to give them prejudices which are in favor of what we regard as the truth, while, at the same time, we impart to them such instruction as will enable them to substantiate their prejudices, if they are true, or to detect whatever of error there may be in them, if they are erroneous?

Again, it may be asked if those who are restrained from giving doctrinal instruction by the doubt we are noticing are consistent in the course which they themselves pursue. Are they as careful not to prejudice their children upon other subjects? Are they not often doing all in their power to give their children right ideas and right principles upon the general subject of moral conduct? Do they not, in order to accomplish this, give line upon line, precept upon precept? But why is this? These right ideas and right principles, valuable as they are and important as they may be to future character, are in the minds of their children only prejudices of early education. Why not leave children to examine these subjects for themselves in after life, unbiased by the influences of early training? Will it be said that correct moral conduct is a matter of such vast and immediate importance, as to authorize the attempt to prejudice the rising generation in its favor? But is it not equally important to give them right prejudices and proper instructions in regard to those great central truths which lie at the foundation of all right feelings and principles, and constitute the only sure basis of a pure, elevated, and enduring morality? Will not consistency require, then, of those who are influenced by the doubt we have noticed, that they neglect entirely all direct instruction upon the whole subject of religious principle and moral conduct?

Still further, it may be asked, whether it is not the duty of the older portion of the community to do all in their power to prejudice the rising generation (if we choose to use that term)

in favor of what is right and true ? Those who have charge of the young, as parents, teachers, or guardians, are to "train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," "in the way in which they should go." And what is implied in this early training ? In what does it consist ? Does it not impose upon those of whom it is required to train up the young the duty of imparting to them true ideas, of cherishing right feelings, and establishing right principles, in their hearts, and of forming them to correct habits of conduct ? Can any one conscientiously perform this duty, and yet neglect to give instruction in regard to those doctrines of Christianity which he sincerely believes to be true, which he honestly regards as of great importance, and which seem to him to lie at the foundation of all true morality ? And must this be called prejudicing childhood ? And may not the same be said of all education ? Must it not necessarily be the case, that great and important truths, upon any subject, which in our minds are the result of conviction based upon arguments and reasons, must become in the mind of the child to whom we impart them more or less the prejudices of education ? And must they not for many years, at least, remain so ? Is it not for this very reason that the young are committed, in so much weakness, to the hands of those older than themselves, that mentally and morally, as well as physically, they may walk, for a time, in the strength and guidance of those in whose hands they are placed ? Our answer, then, to the fear sometimes entertained, that by giving doctrinal instruction in Sunday schools we shall prejudice the young and prevent the possibility of their afterwards examining the subject unbiased for themselves, is, that it is impossible not to prejudice them in some way, and therefore it is important to give them prejudices in favor of what we deem the right and the true ; that, if we would act in all things consistently with this fear, we should neglect giving any direct instruction whatever upon the subject of moral conduct ; and that, if we choose to call this prejudicing the young, yet it is precisely what parents are, by their very relation, required to do.

We have thus far dwelt upon the importance of giving clear and distinct doctrinal instruction to the young. "But why," it may be asked, "should this instruction be given systematically, — why given in Sunday schools ?" To these questions we will, in closing, give brief answers. Instruction upon any subject, which is given systematically, — the sim-

plest elements first, and those truths and principles dependent upon them afterwards, — will be given clearly and thoroughly ; and, consequently, it can be more easily comprehended, and much longer retained, than would otherwise be the case, by the pupil. Then, too, there is a tendency in most minds, at some stage of their religious progress, to arrange and systematize their ideas upon religious subjects, that so they may be more free from confusion and more ready for use. There is, then, a propriety, if we would give instruction upon the doctrines of religion, in doing it systematically ; and if so, the Sunday school would seem to be the place in which it should be given. It has seemed to us, at times, that there is some confusion in the minds of the community in regard to the particular sphere which Sunday school instruction should occupy, in its relation to family and parental instruction. Teachers are often exhorted to watch their opportunities to give various and incidental instruction, as the circumstances and occasions of life may call for it. This they cannot do, because they are with their pupils only one or two hours in a week. But this is precisely the kind of moral and religious instruction which may and should be given by parents and in families. At the same time, it is difficult, in the ordinary circumstances of most families, to give systematic instruction. This should be done at the Sunday school. The meeting of teacher and pupils is an appointed meeting, for which preparation is supposed to be made on both sides. And it is expected that the attention of the class will be directed to the subject upon which preparation has been made, and incidental topics find no place there, excepting in their relation to the regular subject of the exercise. If this division of labor could be fully understood, if parents would give their children incidental religious instruction, as it might be called for or rendered appropriate by their circumstances or their conduct, while the Sunday school teacher is giving systematic instruction upon the facts and truths, the principles and doctrines, of the Gospel, then might we hope that the religious training of our children would be thorough and efficient.

J. W—n.

---

ART. III. — UNITARIANISM IN PORTLAND. — MR. CARY'S  
LETTER ON THE TRINITY.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIRS, — In examining a package of letters of some forty years' standing, presented to me the other day by a friend, I was much gratified to find a long and interesting communication from the Rev. Samuel Cary, formerly colleague with the Rev. Dr. Freeman at the Stone Chapel in Boston. Thinking the letter may give to your readers as much pleasure as it has given to me, I transmit it to you, with the one which called it forth, and such introductory observations as seem to be necessary by way of preface.

Mr. Cary graduated in 1804, and very early came into notice as an acceptable and promising preacher. He supplied Mr. Lowell's pulpit during his absence in 1807. In 1808 he preached for Dr. West and Dr. Freeman in Boston, and his services were eagerly sought for by several other societies. Among these was the First Parish in Portland, to which he was invited to preach as a candidate for settlement in connection with their venerable pastor, Dr. Deane. It was after one of the visits which he made to Portland that he wrote the letter of which I furnish you a copy, in reply to certain questions and doubts submitted to him by Mr. Freeman, a most worthy member of the society and for many years a deacon of the church.

This society was then in an inactive, I might rather say, in a transition state, moving gradually through a change which was then going on in the religious community of New England. In many of the old societies, the rigid Trinitarian creed was giving way ; it had lost its hold upon the understanding and affections of the people. Still it was retained in form, because the mind slowly and reluctantly relinquishes its early-rooted sentiments and prejudices, and because no satisfactory substitute was then offered to the seekers after a more rational faith. Dr. Deane, who had been settled over the parish more than forty years, was what was sometimes called an Arminian and sometimes a moderate Calvinist ; and although not openly avowing Liberal sentiments, still in private rejected the doctrine of the Trinity and the Calvinistic interpretation of the Atonement. His mind was travelling



through the same process which a portion of the religious community was pursuing.

A number of persons in the town, as early as 1792, had taken a stand upon the extreme position of Unitarianism advocated by Priestley and Lindsey, whose tracts and other writings in connection with the correspondence of Dr. Freeman first introduced that doctrine to this section of the country. The leader in this movement was Thomas Oxnard, a man of literary taste and scholarship. Although bred a merchant, he became a reader in the Episcopal church in this town; but having adopted the system of Priestley, he abandoned the Athanasian creed, and openly preached this form of Unitarianism. Ordination was refused him on this ground, when he sought priest's orders; and a majority of his people being dissatisfied with the change, his connection with the church was dissolved, and he continued to preach to a few hearers in a school-house. But the public mind was not ready for the new system, especially the Socinian or Humanitarian phase of it; and at his death, in 1799, the society fell to pieces, the individuals mingled with other communions, and all trace of it as a distinct organization was lost.

The First Parish, in 1807, had been established eighty years, and had been the parent stock from which had sprung five other societies, of various shades of belief, Episcopal and Congregational. During this time, although only two pastors had been settled over it, yet it had never been without one, and for thirty-one years it enjoyed both together.\* Under these peculiar circumstances, it had become drowsy, and there was danger that it would fall entirely asleep, unless it could by some means get an infusion of new life. The most ready means which offered for this purpose was to procure a young man of talents to be united as colleague with their ancient and time-honored pastor. Invitations were

---

\* In this connection, forty years later, I may add the still more extraordinary fact, that the society, from its foundation in 1727, a hundred and twenty years ago, has had but *three* pastors, during thirty-four years of which time two were together; never been a day without one; and the third, Dr. Nichols, is now in the full maturity of his ripe and rich powers, giving hope and promise of making this striking and unusual fact of permanency in the ministry still more extraordinary. The first pastor, Rev. Thomas Smith, was settled in 1727, and died in 1795, aged 95. Rev. Dr. Deane, settled as his colleague in 1764, died in 1814, aged 81. Rev. Dr. Nichols, settled as his colleague in 1809, is still living. They were all graduates of Harvard College, where Dr. Deane and Dr. Nichols were also tutors.

therefore given to the most prominent young men then coming forward in the ministry, of various religious opinions, to preach as candidates. Among these were Mr. McKean, afterwards Professor at Cambridge, Mr. Huntington, subsequently settled at the Old South in Boston, Mr. Thacher, afterwards of the New South, Mr. Miltimore of Newbury, Mr. Cary, Mr. Codman of Dorchester, Mr. Ely, lately of Philadelphia, and, lastly, the present pastor, Dr. Nichols. Some of these, having other engagements, declined being considered as candidates; and it is believed that on only one, previously to Mr. Nichols, did the parish go so far as to take a vote in regard to a settlement, and that was upon Mr. Codman. This gentleman had just returned from Europe; his manner was glowing and ardent, his style florid, his faith of the popular creed, and he had many friends in the town. Dr. Deane, too, who felt the infirmities of age, was sensitive on the subject and anxious for relief, as will be seen by the following letter to one of the committee for supplying the pulpit:—

“Portland, 28th Sept., 1808.

“Dear Sir, — I rejoice that you are returned. I visited your office to-day, but you were gone. Mr. Codman has told me that he is under necessity to go home next week. I dread to be left alone, for I am not equal to preaching twice in one day. Mr. Codman is greatly admired by many. He is orthodox and ingenious, and I think he is very generally admired. I wish we may be directed to do what is best.”

The question being thus pressed to an immediate decision, and under such sanction, resulted in a vote by the church of six to two in favor of Mr. Codman, in which the parish non-concurred by a vote of sixty-two to three, and this chiefly on the ground of his religious opinions. The parish had never before been placed in a situation where its sectarian tendency had been put to the test; it was now too clearly expressed to be mistaken.

This distinct avowal was probably hastened by the zeal with which Mr. Payson, who had been ordained as colleague with Mr. Kellogg over the Second Parish the preceding December, advocated the doctrines of Calvin. His settlement introduced a new era in the religious history of the town. Mr. Kellogg had been placed as the first pastor, nearly a quarter of a century before, over the Second Parish, composed principally of seceders from the First Parish; ardent

and eccentric, he had a great popularity at the commencement of his ministry, which gradually declined, and left his society in no better condition than that from which it had separated. Liberal and catholic in his feelings, although decidedly Trinitarian, he had ever maintained relations of friendly intercourse and harmony with the parent society. Perceiving the declension of both numbers and religious interest in his flock, and probably suspecting the cause, his practised mind discovered in Mr. Payson those high qualities which would breathe new life into his congregation, and he spared no efforts to secure his coöperation. His visions were more than realized. A congregation and church were collected such as never met before or since in Maine. But Mr. Kellogg was not permitted to enjoy the triumph; for after having, with the fondness of a father and the ardor of an apostle, prepared the field, the younger and more aspiring prophet excluded the ancient seer wholly from the rewards and enjoyments of the harvest. The same pulpit and the same parish were not large enough for both; and in four years the connection was dissolved, the elder giving place to the younger. They have both gone to their account.

Mr. Payson, immediately on his settlement, struck out a new path. He appealed ardently to the sensibilities and passions of his hearers; he aroused their fears by exhibiting in glowing colors the appalling terrors of the future, to which the deep, sepulchral tones of his voice were peculiarly suited and gave new horror. He drew around him the ardent and excitable, those who were deeply imbued with a religious spirit, as well as those who had no settled opinions on the subject, but who were attracted by the surpassing eloquence and impassioned manner of the gifted preacher. The effect of his preaching resembled what we are told of Whitefield's more than that of any other since his day, and in the same sense he may be justly called a New Light. But Whitefield had by no means the exclusive spirit of modern Orthodoxy. Mr. Payson, seeing every thing in the color of his own views, and believing that truth existed only in the form in which he embraced it, assumed that all who did not adopt his creed were in gross error and religious darkness. He therefore drew the broad line of separation between his own and all other modes of belief; and when Mr. Nichols was, in 1809, presented to the association of Congregational ministers, which then embraced the whole county, for approval as the col-

league of Dr. Deane, Mr. Payson stood alone in withholding from him ecclesiastical approbation on the ground of his religious sentiments, denied to him Christian fellowship, and would never admit him to his pulpit, although it was earnestly desired by the people of the First Parish and by many of his own.

This uncompromising sectarianism, stiffened into a rigid and exclusive system, widened the breach between the two societies and the two religious parties, and brought those who were inclined to Liberal views, although not before clearly defined in their own understandings, to a prompt avowal of the anti-Calvinistic scheme, and an open vindication of their principles. The excitement produced by this controversy kept the town in agitation for many years, dividing families and producing unhappy alienations. Since Mr. Payson's death, in 1827, there has been a gradual amelioration of feeling. The opposing parties, which on the first separation flew off to opposite extremes, have been drawing nearer together in Christian sympathy, and approaching a common ground of truth. The various benevolent and moral efforts in which they have heartily united have revealed to them that they have a common nature, a common Father who is over all, and one end and destiny which they are all striving to attain. Less reliance seems now to be placed on subtle and metaphysical distinctions than formerly, and more on those fundamental principles and truths on which all who sincerely love God and his Son may find room enough to stand together in hearty brotherhood.

The correspondence between Deacon Freeman and Mr. Cary, which gives occasion to this article, took place about midway between the settlement of Mr. Payson and the ordination of Mr. Nichols, and at a time when the public mind was awaking to the themes on which it touches. It has an important historical connection, and, no doubt, exhibits a state of opinion which existed in many of the old societies in New England at that day. None of them, it is believed, except King's Chapel in Boston, had openly avowed Unitarian sentiments; but that such sentiments were entertained to a considerable extent, as in the First Parish in Portland, subsequent events have clearly established. It is equally true, that they existed, unconsciously to their possessors, in many minds which could not assent to the doctrines of Calvin and Hopkins. The controversy, which commenced in 1815 with the



republication by the Orthodox party in Boston of portions of Mr. Belsham's *Life of Lindsey*, under the title of "*American Unitarianism*," placed before the community the distinctive features of the two grand religious theories which now divide the public mind in New England. It was then that the parties arranged themselves, as by an elective affinity, under their appropriate standards, and the separation between the Orthodox and Unitarian communities became entire and complete.

Mr. Freeman, whose letter called forth Mr. Cary's reply, was a man of unexceptionable character. He had filled most important offices, and largely influenced public opinion in this community. He was a member of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, and its secretary at the commencement of the Revolution, register and judge of probate, clerk of the courts, postmaster, and principal selectman, for many years; almost his whole life was spent in office: and he had a heart full of charity and benevolence, blended with a high capacity for business. He took a warm interest in the religious prosperity of the town, and originated or engaged in all objects of philanthropy and public good. Notwithstanding the expression of belief in his letter, he never joined the Orthodox communion, nor did he fully adopt their sentiments, but remained to the end of his life a firm friend of the First Parish, and of its pastor, Mr. Nichols, and deacon of the church, steadily but fruitlessly endeavouring to reconcile the belligerent parties and their differing faiths. He died in 1831, at the age of eighty-eight, a good man and devoted Christian.

Mr. Cary, in his letter, freely and candidly defines his position, and that of Unitarians in this country; and I cannot but deem it a valuable contribution to the history of Unitarianism among us. He was not destined to behold the full establishment of the doctrines he ardently cherished and so clearly advocated, for his untimely death in 1815, at the early age of twenty-six, was contemporaneous with the commencement of the open controversy on this side of the Atlantic. I now proceed to give the correspondence, without further remark.

W. W.

---

MR. FREEMAN'S LETTER.

Aug. 18, 1808.

DEAR SIR,—The frankness which you discovered, when

you were in this town, together with the intimation you made to me, that a letter on the subject I barely mentioned to you on leaving would be favorably received, induce me candidly to communicate in this way some ideas which are in my mind, and which I think it proper, under existing circumstances, that you should be acquainted with.

In the first place, I consider, from what you said to me, and what I have heard from others, that it is not your present opinion that our Saviour was coexistent from eternity with the Father ;—that he was not, on the contrary, as the Socinians believe, a mere man ; but (as I conceive to be the Arian doctrine) that he was created before all worlds, the first and noblest of all beings ;—that you were, however, open to conviction, and, on weighing the argument on the subject, would form an independent judgment for yourself.

Secondly, as to my own opinion, which is this :—That Christ, while upon earth, had two natures or characters, a Divine and human ; that he possessed the former from eternity, and therein is equal to the Father, and that in the latter, connected, however, in a mysterious union with the other, he made an atonement for the sins of men. I observed to you that I thought but few of our parish believed in the Trinity. I formed my opinion, in some measure, from what was just before observed to me by Dr. Deane in regard thereto. But whatever may be the opinion of others, I cannot but think there is authority from Scripture to justify the belief. I have since conversed with Dr. Deane upon this subject, and find that he thinks that the Holy Ghost is God, but that he is not a third person in the Godhead. This sentiment is to me inexplicable.

Your opinion of the doctrine of the Atonement, Dr. Deane informs me, agrees with his. This sentiment I did not expect from him, for I had conceived that it was the general opinion of divines that it would not be considered to have been sufficient but under the idea that Christ was a divine or uncreated being, and that, without being immortal himself, he could not confer immortality on others. . . . .

Your discourses here appeared to me to relate chiefly to the doctrine of obedience ; and I deem it proper to say, that I recollect nothing in any of them but what accorded with my own sentiments.

## MR. CARY'S REPLY.

Exeter, August 25, 1808.

DEAR SIR, — I have received your letter of the 18th, which was delayed a few days by being missent to Salem. I am much obliged to you for it ; because it gives me an opportunity of explaining to you the present state of my theological opinions, and in the same unreserved manner in which you have disclosed your own. I wish to hold no sentiments on any subject whatever that cannot be defended ; and if I believe the arguments to be on my side, it is my duty, as it is the duty of every honest man, to make a fair, explicit avowal of such sentiments, and of the reasoning by which they are proved. We ought not to be ashamed of our opinions, because it is in fact being ashamed of at least what we conceive to be *some part* of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And I think there would be no motive for concealing them, even on the score of prudence, if we could only learn to give disputed points no more consequence than they really deserve. To me they seem hardly worth contending about, — certainly not worth contending about passionately, — because I cannot believe that a man who is known to be in the habit of fearing God and keeping his commandments, who has satisfied his understanding that Jesus Christ is a messenger from God, and that the Bible contains the message which God has sent us, and is the only rule of faith and practice, and does strive to conform himself to the example of his Saviour, — that such a man will finally forfeit salvation merely because he does not believe exactly as Calvin did, or Athanasius, or Hopkins.

Now, if this indeed is true, — if good men of all sects of Christians will meet together in heaven, — how is it possible to avoid the inference, that the peculiar distinguishing tenets of these sects are equally unimportant, that is, equally unnecessary to salvation ? If we could all be prevailed upon to admit this principle, and to act accordingly, it would no longer be necessary to disavow or disguise what we believe on the subject of the Trinity, or of Original Sin, or of Necessity, or of any other speculative topic, any more than it is necessary to conceal what we think about the measures of government, or the theory of gravitation, or any thing else which belongs confessedly to evidence and to reason.

The doctrine of the Trinity seems to have been defended and disputed with more zeal and acrimony than any other

questionable subject ; and why it should have been so I am unable to conceive, unless there really is a propensity in human nature to search most eagerly, and decide most peremptorily, on subjects which are absolutely above the reach of our understandings. For my own part, I cannot reflect upon the theories of men about the nature of the incomprehensible God, and the confidence with which they talk of his essence and substance, and the parts of which he is composed, and the mode in which his Son proceeded from him or was generated or created, without being astonished at human boldness and arrogance. My dear Sir, is it possible for such beings as we are, who cannot tell for our lives how a blade of grass grows, or what is the nature of our own body or soul, to form any sort of conception of *the nature* of the First Cause of all things, who is invisible, and whom no man ever can see and live ? And if we cannot comprehend his nature, can any thing be more preposterous than to draw up theories in human language, the object of which is to explain this unintelligible subject, and to believe them of importance enough to be made articles of faith, and to be received as fundamental and essential doctrines in a revelation from the Deity ?

We know that God exists, and we know what are his moral attributes. We know that he has made us, has given us laws, and requires that we should obey. We know that his Son Jesus Christ, a glorious being, was sent to mankind to disclose to them the will of his Father ; that he is our Master, the way and the truth and life. We know, further, that there is a Divine influence, operating in some way or other upon the heart ; this influence is termed the Holy Ghost, or Spirit, or the Comforter ; that it will assist our efforts to become pure and holy, and will do that for us which we cannot do for ourselves. All this is perfectly intelligible. And why is it so ? Because all this intimately concerns us. It is necessary that we should know it, that we may act understandingly, — that we may perform our part and complete our task. But when we attempt to go further, and undertake to settle the precise *nature* of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to explain the substance of each, or the mode of their existence, it is no wonder that we should be lost among insuperable difficulties, for we then meddle with things which are too wonderful for us. We then undertake to lay down as truths what God has not revealed to man, —



at least, what my Bible has not revealed to me. And why has not God revealed them? For this plain reason, because the human understanding, constituted as it now is, cannot comprehend them.

You say in your letter, Sir, that you "believe that there is ground in the Scriptures to justify the doctrine of the Trinity." Perhaps we do not both affix precisely the same ideas to this term. The doctrine of the Trinity I take to be this. *Trinity*, you know, Sir, is a word of human coining, composed of two Latin words, *tres*, three, and *unus*, one, or *tres in uno*, three in one. The Trinitarian, therefore, believes that there is one Supreme Being or God, but that this Being is composed of three distinct parts or persons, each of which possesses the properties of a distinct person, each of which has attributes that the others have not, each of which is truly and properly God, equal to the others in power and glory, and equally to be adored; but that, for all this, there are not three Gods, but one God. This is the Athanasian theory as explained in the creed. The only real Trinitarians are they who believe the Athanasian creed. I have been disposed to think that you did not believe this creed. Dr. Deane, I know, treats it with the utmost contempt. We must, however, as you justly observe, think for ourselves; and I am perfectly ready to own to you that it seems to me pure, genuine, unmixed nonsense. Before I can admit it, I must give up my reason, my common sense, all the powers of comprehending truth with which God has blessed me; a sacrifice which I have never yet considered myself bound to make. If there are in the Godhead three distinct persons, having three distinct volitions, and equal to each other in power and glory, then it as certainly follows that there are three distinct Gods, as any one proposition in nature can certainly follow from another. And there are no possible means, that I can conceive of, of getting rid of this inference.

St. Athanasius, indeed, has pronounced that there are not three Gods, but one God; and because he was a saint (for I know no other right he could have had of dictating), his followers are required to say so, too. But if St. Athanasius had taken it into his head to say, that three men walking in the street together were not three men, but one man, we must have had a more than ordinary share of credulity not to say at once that the saint was beside himself. Now, to my understanding, these two propositions rest on the same footing.

I treat this hypothesis with some freedom, because it is one of those speculative subjects alluded to in the introduction to this letter, which I take to be absolutely of human invention, absolutely unimportant in itself, and which must stand or fall as it is supported or otherwise by reason and the Scriptures. Supported by reason it certainly is not; and it has always been a subject of astonishment to me, how the world could for so many ages have believed it taught in the Bible. Without stating the arguments which have induced me to reject it (for I cannot do this in a letter already too long), I can only say, generally, that I believe it contradictory to, and contradicted by, both particular texts and the very nature and spirit of the whole volume of inspiration.

Perhaps there may be a little ambiguity in your expression, "justified by the Scriptures." It is among the standing jests of infidels, that the followers of Jesus Christ are split into a thousand opposite sects, each of which declares that its opinions are justified by the Scriptures; as if the Bible could possibly countenance sentiments intrinsically opposed to each other. But the truth is, these clashing opinions are not justified by the Scriptures. They may be justified, perhaps, by a few particular passages, dexterously culled from various parts of the Bible, and construed so as seemingly to favor them; but the sacred writings, considered as a whole, are uniform and consistent, and speak by one language. And I have long since laid it down as a maxim, that the general current of Scripture never can be in favor of any proposition which human reason, uncontrolled and unprejudiced, pronounces impossible. I admit, that if the Deity should reveal to us a mystery, even though it should be perfectly incomprehensible and perfectly contradictory to all our notions, and require us to believe it, we must believe it; but I contend, also, that such a mysterious truth must be revealed to us in such plain, clear, incontrovertible terms, that no man living to whom it is communicated can have the smallest doubt that it is indeed revealed. I suspect that the mysteries, or at least most of them, which are supposed to belong to the Christian religion, are in fact the offspring of abstruse, obscure, metaphysical systems of divinity, rather than of the Bible. The religion of Jesus Christ, as taught in his own sermons and conversations with his followers, seems to me perfectly plain and inexpressibly beautiful; and in these I find nothing of the Orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, as its advocates term it.

The term Unitarian comprehends a great number of sects, — indeed, all that variety which denies the equality of the Son with the Father and the personality of the Holy Spirit. The Arian, the Sabellian, the advocate of the Indwelling Scheme, the Socinian, etc., are all, as I conceive, Unitarians. Some admit the preëxistence of our Saviour, but dispute his divinity, properly so called. Some believe the Father and Son one and the same being, but do not believe that the Spirit is a distinct being, having the attributes of a person. Some deny both the divinity and preëxistence of the Saviour. But neither of them are Trinitarians.

I have satisfied myself, Sir, that the doctrine of the perfect unity of the Supreme Being lies at the foundation of all true religion. I think it may be demonstrated, as far as any moral proposition can be demonstrated. I believe only in one God. I acknowledge only one God. I pay divine honors only to one. Having settled this principle in my mind, I feel entitled to demand the most unquestionable proof that Jesus Christ, — who is represented throughout the Bible as the Son of God, who never in any one instance confesses himself to be the Supreme Being, but only the Messiah, the prophet that was to come, the messenger from heaven, the door and the way and the guide to heaven, — that he is in fact the very God to whom he would lead me, or has equal claims to his honor, to his character, and his place. It must be proved, also, beyond all dispute, that the Divine influence, or Spirit, of which I know nothing more than that it exists, is in deed and in truth another distinct person, who has a right to be worshipped also as God. Until this is proved, — and I have never yet read any arguments which do it to my satisfaction, — I must retain my present opinion, that there is but one self-existent Being in the universe, and that all other beings are the creatures of his hand. The only thing which gives importance to the doctrine of the Divinity of the Saviour is its practical influence on our worship. If he is Divine, then he is the true God, and must be worshipped as God; if he is not God, such worship is blasphemy.

I am sensible that this letter is unfinished. But I have made it much too long. I wished to have said more on the subject of our Saviour, and to have given you my ideas of Atonement and other points. You will have the goodness to excuse the very great freedom, and perhaps too great, with

which I have written ; and remember me to Dr. Deane, whose remark I often think of, and am consoled with, that "the Deity will not punish us in another world for not having understood in this what cannot be understood."

I am, dear Sir,

Respectfully, your obed't serv't,

S. CARY.

S. FREEMAN, Esq.

---

ART. IV.—TREATMENT OF SLAVERY AT THE NORTH.\*

HERE was an honest man burning his life out by ardent indignation against the wrongs of the slave. The book leaves rather a sad and disagreeable impression on the mind. We sympathize with its noble enthusiasm for justice, but are too cold-blooded to enjoy the impatience and peevishness wrung from that soul of fire by the disappointments of its enthusiasm. Mr. Rogers, as is often the case with the passionately upright, was also excessively and morbidly downright. Evils which God and man have borne with for centuries he could not tolerate, no, not for an hour ; and when he struggled manfully to remove them,—which was well,—but could not succeed at once, he showed himself as good a hater of his opposers as Dr. Johnson could have desired,—and this we think was not well, in spite of "the great English moralist." But far be it from us to join with the enemies of the cause he had at heart in drawing any inference against that cause from his imperfections. On the contrary, we charge upon slavery the wreck of this gifted and generous man's native gentleness and cheerful affectionateness to all the human family. His happiness was one more victim among the holocausts of that omnivorous Moloch. The Rev. John Pierpont, in a biographical preface, has delineated with touching affection the many excellences of his friend, passing with a light hand over his faults, and abundantly illustrating his singularly unselfish heart through all the ravages of lifelong disease and varied misfortune upon his

---

\* *A Collection from the Newspaper Writings of Nathaniel Peabody Rogers.* Concord: J. R. French. 1847. 12mo. pp. 380.



temper. We have seldom read biography written in so sweet and mellowed a spirit. Rough and thorny experience in the same unpopular cause, which too often exacerbated the subject of the memoir, seems to have had a softening and maturing effect upon the judgment and temperament of its writer. The rest of the volume consists of selections from Mr. Rogers's editorial and other contributions to the newspaper press. They are written with a sharp and fiery pen, moving at almost the speed of a magnetic telegraph. "As a newspaper writer," his biographer thinks him "unequalled by any living man"; and a glance at a page detects the strength, clearness, and quickness of his intellect, his ready humor, original fancy, and rich suggestiveness. He was an *extempore* man in all he did, with pen, tongue, hands, or feet; disdaining consistency, and therefore changing his opinions often rashly and precipitately, as we think, and making fatal mistakes. On religion he rushed into all extremes. The first article in this collection rates the "Christian Examiner" for being destitute of vital religion; but before we reach the end of the book, he has almost come to the conclusion that love to God is hatred to man. But his religion went as one of his many precious sacrifices before what he deemed the proslavery spirit of the community and the communion in which he lived. The Church had proved recreant to the cause of humanity, he thought, and therefore he hesitated not, but renounced it and all its works, and thenceforth seemed to consider it his chief mission to vituperate church and state, and all who upheld them. His talent for invective was not exceeded in the Antislavery ranks, and that is saying something; but we believe his purity of motive was equally preëminent. Few of those who professed opposition to slavery were acknowledged by him as coming up to the mark. The great mass of us lay weltering, according to his judgment, in the defilements and abominations of proslavery hard-heartedness. It would be well to let the admonitions of his spirited volume stimulate all who read it to the inquiry, how we really stand in that matter.

While we differ from Mr. Rogers in regard to many of his conclusions, and the temper with which they are pressed, we would say as earnestly as he, — If not antislavery, let us at least not be proslavery. This is the lowest position that should satisfy the conscience of Northern Christians. If the North has nothing to do with the South about the

matter, hands off; but let our hands never be raised in defence of the institution that is peculiarly Southern. A most interesting question for us therefore is, What is it to be proslavery? Who is proslavery? The epithet is affixed with wanton facility by some where we should least expect to find it applied. It is almost amusing to see the indiscriminating readiness with which it is thrown about. Some of the best lovers of liberty, and some who have made sacrifices to it for which their maligners have had no opportunity, to say no more, have been so branded. One would suppose it was the perverse and impolitic object, to make out as few friends of freedom as possible, and thus to repel and discourage them. It is proslavery here, and proslavery there, and proslavery everywhere; reminding us somewhat of the man described by an uncomplimentary title, who scattereth firebrands, arrows, and death in sport. Or it reminds us, rather, of the facility with which any decent citizen became "suspect" under the reign of terror in France, when to be "suspect" was sure guilt and death. So now, if a cautious man is not entirely prepared for the dissolution of the Union, he is "suspect" of all proslavery abominations. If a clergyman is not heard to broach the subject in the pulpit on some day when the accuser happens to drop into the church, he is set down as proslavery. He may have uttered other and more expensive protests, he may have preached on the subject the Sunday before or the forenoon of that same day; but that goes for nothing, if he is not all the time dropping line upon line and precept upon precept touching one and the same sin. We know of one clergyman who preached about it every Sunday for a month, and before it was mentioned in any other Unitarian pulpit of this city; and he was published as an apologizer for slavery. More recently we read a letter in an antislavery paper from one of these sharp-scented hunters after proslavery guilt, who had attended *once* at an Orthodox church, because he had heard that the distinguished pastor had announced himself an Abolitionist, and he wished to test the truth of the report. On the strength of this one attendance, when some other topic in the vast and varied field of Christian duty had come up, he wrote the letter to assure the antislavery public that the rumor was a mistake, and that this eminent laborer in every form of philanthropy was undeserving of his fame, because neither through prayer, hymn, nor sermon did the word slave or slavery occur.

We object to this, among other reasons, because it is itself (if we may be allowed for once to join the *suspectful*) of proslavery tendency. It is adapted "to aid and comfort the enemy." The design may be unexceptionable, and for this reason we have been reluctant to say a word against the well-meaning laborers in a righteous cause who have to toil against opposers quite numerous and strong enough already. Far be it from us to join in the contemporary, and only contemporary, clamor against these men. The clamorers may be Stentors, but they are not Calchases. They are not endowed with the gift of prophecy. They live for the day and read newspapers, unaware that history is of to-morrow, and unlike to-day's newspaper in its tone, — that to-morrow will reconsider to-day's short-sighted judgments, and wonder indignantly at the doings of many who now wonder at themselves admiringly. Honor to the voices that are raised for the oppressed, though they are not always very musical voices! Honor to all who, with whatever mistakes, remember the forgotten and attend to the neglected!

But even for the sake of the cause they have so close at heart it is most important to inquire more discriminatingly than they are apt to, who are really the proslavery men? What is it that constitutes a proslavery man? A man may be proslavery in one aspect, who is not so in another. His actions may seem so, while his design is not; as his design may be so, while the effect of his actions accidentally is not. It is only he who wishes to be so that should be stigmatized by the epithet. The motive is the man. We are "justified by faith." He who "esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean." This disregard of motives, this confounding in indiscriminate reprobation all who happen, whether they intend it or not, and whether they know it or not, to uphold some injustice, is too much like that tearing up of the wheat with the tares so censured by our Master.

The most ultra abolitionists should not object to this distinction, when they consider, that, if the effect rather than the intention of our actions is to incur the brand of proslavery, they themselves incur it sometimes. How often are they told that by their extravagance they are riveting the fetters of the slave! And though this is not true generally, for hundreds have obtained freedom since the abolition movement for one who did before, yet it is undeniable that in particular cases slavery has been made a heavier burden

through this excitement. Ever and anon, a slave, striving to roll off the stone that rested on his race, — to apply here the beautiful metaphor of Mrs. Butler's sonnet to Pius the Ninth, — has had it fall back on him and crush him. Is therefore Mr. Garrison a proslavery man, because his powerful appeals have made that slave's heart burn within him at the view of his bruised and bleeding brothers? Is Henry C. Wright proslavery? Is Stephen Foster a bigoted foe to abolition? And yet, if they went South, and were allowed to live long enough to hear it, they might be told, as we have been, that such persons were the main stay and chief hope of the advocates for the perpetuity of slavery. They would be hung, — there is little doubt of that, — but it would be for what they *wished* to do. Their wishes, then, make them antislavery. And is not a wish as essential on the one side as on the other?

Again, the use of the products of slave labor appears to some persons a proslavery act. Its effect is to enrich and encourage the slave-driver. It braids the field-whip. It sounds the daybreak horn. It prolongs the task till the sun is low. It brings crowds to the auction-block, on which the slave stands to be felt and handled like a brute, and show his teeth and tongue, and sometimes to strip himself for closer investigation of his capabilities. If there was no market for the fruits of his enforced toils, instead of being chained and driven in a "drove" to that block, he would be marched to the emigrant ship, or to the registration-office for record of his emancipation. And yet some who, as they think, go farthest for abolition, do not deem it worth while to abstain from slave productions. The inconvenience would be great, and the effect small, they think, and the pecuniary cost of such a rule of abstinence would cramp their means for more expedient antislavery measures. Therefore we do not stigmatize them as a "brotherhood of thieves." They may stir their tea to the saccharine satisfaction of the sweetest tooth among them, and no one moves a resolution that "the body of abolitionists, like the body of the clergy, with a few honorable exceptions, are robbers, murderers, adulterers, pirates," etc., and, by way of softening amendment, adds the words, "or something worse." So, too, every act of kindness or respect to slaveholders is pronounced proslavery in its influence. Every common civility, every expression of tolerance, every neglect of an op-



portunity to injure them, does something to strengthen their hands. It may be that some abolitionists can enter a disclaimer against any omission of duty here. Their consciences may reproach them with no superfluous respect or civilities to the "man-stealer." They are clear in their great account, and have infringed no rule of churlishness, have violated no obligation of discourtesy, have broken no pledge of general uncharitableness, in all fitting times and places. But we have been singularly unfortunate in our acquaintance with this body, if this is a fair description of their general or average hostility to Chesterfield. They cannot claim so entire and exemplary a faithfulness to the conscientious principle of antislavery rudeness in every case. Only a few ascend the heights of the crowning grace of this universal anti-Christian, as well as antislavery, boorishness. Those that we have known — we must confess it — exhibited the weaknesses of humanity. They were rather remarkable for a full share of the frailties and infirmities of temper and disposition that constitute the spirit exemplified and commended in an old book, and sometimes called the spirit of the lamb and of the dove. And we challenge the ultraist, who may pride himself on having most strenuously evinced the grace of perseverance in duty, to prove that he has been entirely consistent in this matter. If he have ever let a day pass without seeking opportunity for the cold shoulder and the cut direct, and all such delicate little attentions, he may say, with the Emperor Titus, "I have lost a day." Nay, if he have refused to injure the oppressor of his brethren when he could conveniently and safely, he has been false to the good soldier's first principle of doing all the injury to the enemy in his power. Excite insurrections on the plantation, reduce the slaveholder's means and strength in any way, and you cut the sinews of oppression.

Instead of this, we find our best abolitionists inconsiderately joining palms with men of whom they have no assurance that their palms have not been soiled with the wages of unrighteousness; unlike O'Connell, who refused the hand of a slaveholder, and always inquired if an American was from the Northern or Southern States, before he would be introduced to him, and rejected with disdain the application of Mr. Somebody from Alabama for admission into the House of Commons, because he could not pass muster with the thoroughgoing Liberator on the delicate point. It seems to us,

he might have let in the poor Alabamian, and been glad to have him go where his own liberating speeches were to be heard. But the difficulty was, it would have had an appearance of politeness ; and, being open to that objection, this wholehearted man would not listen to any suggestions of vanity. Our abolitionists are not so consistent. They are too good Christians to be thorough abolitionists. They have lived in New England, and attended schools and churches from childhood, where the New Testament was read. They are faint-hearted for insolence, and want pluck even for giving back to the Southron as good as he brings. They cannot do as much as our old college classmate, Dick C., used to do, when an ungentle member of the class evinced a disposition to shake hands with him. Dick was *semper paratus*, always on the watch for this alarming operation. It would have been dreadful to be taken by surprise. Who knows what the consequences might have been, if a Southern aristocrat of the purest water, with hands innocent of toil, pure from any act of usefulness through life, had been surprised by any emergency into a junction of palms with some "unwashed artificer" ? So Dick always had his gloves at hand, but reversed the ordinary use of those integuments. "Other people," said he, "pull off their gloves when they are going to shake hands. A great mistake. What should we think of pulling off our shoe or boot when we were going to give a kick ; and a glove is only a *hand-shoe*. That is the German name for it." So, as soon as symptoms were observed of an approach to close quarters, Dick's hands were behind his back, and his right glove slipped on. Then he was "prepared for either fortune." He who would eschew exerting all proslavery influence should put on his hand-shoes, like Dick, when he must strike hands with the dealer in human flesh ; only he should put them on, not behind his back, but openly and ostentatiously. It will tell better. The insult will be more direct and pointed.

But, to be done with this trifling, is it not evident that we are all proslavery, more or less, if it be predicated of what we do, rather than of what it is our general purpose to do ? And we are so, simply because opposition to slavery, important and imperative as it is, is not our only duty. We meet men in other relations and capacities than as the inflictors and countenancers of slavery, and must treat them according to the claims of all their relations and capacities.

We meet them as men. As men, they have claims upon us. For the same reasons precisely for which we oppose them as slaveholders, we must love them and serve them as men. Justice and humanity impel us to oppose their oppressions. Justice and humanity are what we complain of their withholding from the slave. And shall we not practise justice and humanity toward them? Let us render as much as we demand. Let us be proslavery enough to do justice to the guiltiest trampler on his brother, and to pity him even because he is guilty. If for insisting on this we are termed apologizers for slaveholders, our answer is, we wish to apologize for every kind of sinner as much as we can. Would that we could extenuate and find excuses for every crime, — not cover it up and connive at it, but really lessen the apparent criminality as much as possible! Shall we not rejoice to find our brother better than we feared he was? Will it not benefit our souls to see the world as full of virtue as may be? Shall we not thank God that “there is a soul of goodness even in things evil”?

But most carefully should we stop short at the requisitions of justice and humanity, and never go a step beyond them toward approbation of wrong. It may require nice discrimination, sometimes, to trace the line of difference. Our safeguard will be in asking ourselves ever and anon, — Do we heartily wish slavery to cease? Do we smile upon the slaveholder chiefly to forward this end? While we are just and kind to him, is it, more than any thing else, to make him just and kind to others?

To be just and kind to him, we must discriminate between the different kinds of slaveholders. There are, in the first place, those who are sagacious and clear-headed enough to know that they are doing wrong, and yet do it. Custom and prejudice and early associations blind many to the injustice of the institution, but a few are sharp-sighted enough to see through these mists, and condemn and despise themselves. Yet it is less painful to be self-condemned and self-despised than to relax their grasp on lucre. We find such men South and North. We have known them sell their own children, and brothers and sisters. If they could grow rich by it, they might be induced to contemplate selling their own father's only son. “All is property which the law makes property,” they say, “and they are not bound to be wiser or better than the law.” So their sons and brothers to the

coffle for new lands and more burning skies, ever more and more southward, as poor Mexico falls before the marauder, and their daughters and sisters to the brothel for their fathers' and brothers' unholy gains. "The law allows it, and therefore it is right." This class is often from the North. What shall we say of such men?

"La lor cieca vita è tanto bassa,  
Misericordia e Giustizia gli sdegna,  
Non ragioniam di lor', ma guarda e passa."

But all are not such ghouls and hyenas, tearing flesh and lapping blood. This class is small, compared with others who love and uphold slavery from somewhat more respectable motives than sheer avarice. In fact, avarice is not the Southern vice. They who do not make their own money do not attach so much importance to it, as they who have to work for themselves from lack of others to work for them. These last know what it costs, by aching backs and wearied limbs. To the others it seems to come naturally and easily, like the air or water, choice blessings, but too cheap to seem precious, — unless it may be to the Irish laborers who lay aqueduct pipes all day in the hot sun, and through the stifling summer nights gasp and pant in their close, unventilated cellars and alleys. They know what water and air are worth; and so the hard-working Northern man knows how sweet are the wages of toil. But the indolent Southron, in general, enjoys the institution of slavery chiefly for the sense of personal consequence which it flatters. It gives power. It establishes an order of nobility. It draws even a broader line than between noble and serf, when they are of the same color. There are many more points of distinction than existed between Norman conqueror and Saxon vassal, more, even, than between Spanish hidalgo and Mexican Indian. In the strong citadels of the institution, where it is intensified to the exclusion of all labor that is not done by black hands, a white man, *quoad* white, is a kind of nobleman, if we may not say demigod. Sweet it is to be looked up to by all on whom his eyes can rest. Sweet is power, whether adored for its favors, or tremblingly dreaded for its tyrannies. Pleasant to an amiable man are the patriarchal relation and affections, and, ridiculed as the word has been, we have seen it justified in certain exceptional cases. Doubtless these feelings are the stronghold of slavery with many who have been convinced by sun-bright statistical facts, and



such unquestionable calculations as two and two making four, that free labor is the most profitable. They do not dispute this, but this is not enough. We of the North misapprehend many points of the case, from the greater estimate we put on thrift, and on the energy and foresight, prudence, general intelligence, and skill that insure the prosperity and wealth of New England. We suppose, that, to abolish slavery, we have only to ask Kentucky to cast a look across the Ohio river. "See what freedom does. See the general diffusion of comfort and newspapers. The people are all thriving and intelligent." "That is just what we don't want," answers the slaveholder; "we wish to enjoy luxury and education as social distinctions. If the greasy rabble are as good as I am, and perhaps think themselves a little better, that is no land for a gentleman to live in." This was just the substance of the answer made by a native of "the Ancient Dominion," whom we encountered in a steamboat leaving Wheeling for Cincinnati, to which he had removed from Virginia. We were disposed to felicitate him on his exchange of a slave for a free State as his residence, and began by asking him how he got along without slaves. "Ah, Sir," said he, "that is the sore point in my destiny. Circumstances have made it expedient for me to live in Ohio, and it is a State possessed of many advantages; but it has no slaves! and I love slavery! I am doing well, far better than at home; but I do love slavery! In Virginia I was a planter; in Ohio I am nobody. I have just been visiting the old pleasant land, to be refreshed by the sight of the slaves, and feel like a gentleman for a while once more. Boy," (and he seemed to enjoy the opportunity of calling a man of sixty a boy, for at the South a dark skin is the elixir of perpetual youth,) "boy, pick up my handkerchief."

These are rather more sentimental reasons for upholding "the patriarchal institution" than is the lust of money; but they prevail among the patrician families, and these, being the most enlightened, see, or ought to see, the unrighteousness of what they do. In every other case they can discern most perspicaciously between *meum* and *tuum*. They assent admiringly to the beauty of the sentiment, as they sit in their lordly cathedrals and hear their prelates — "fishers of men," and as earnestly owners of them — preach that they should do to others as they would have others do to them. But the pride and prejudice of the cavalier bar his way to

simple justice. It will be very difficult to break through the stronghold in which he is intrenched ; but it is very certain that menace and reviling will not do it. The most likely mode of succeeding will be to convince him that we can be gentlemen without being slave-owners ; and Billingsgate vituperation is the last means for convincing him of this.

We have supposed these two classes to know that they are doing wrong. But a long and intimate knowledge of the South satisfies us that most of the population are troubled with no such idea. They are born into a system of iniquity. It seems the natural and only state of things ; for they have always seen it so. The happy associations of childhood, the love of their mothers and fathers, the pleasantness of their genial climate, the native hilarity of the African temperament, the general cheerfulness of the sunny South, all weave gladdening accompaniments around slavery, that hide its ugliness ; like the luxuriant garlands of their forests, that throng up naturally, clustering round some rough and gnarled oak, till the decaying and unsightly trunk is lost to view, and seems a column of bright flowers.

What is wanted by this class is light. Ah ! sadly do they want it. But how to get it to them ? How shall they be taught to analyze an institution, so as to separate its loathsome essence from its fascinating concomitants, — an institution which, it has been truly said, is never in the abstract, but which they have from their birth seen intimately interwoven with all their social arrangements ? How shall they discriminate between the absolute injustice, and the virtues of many who perpetuate it ? How can they see unrighteousness through so much of the noblest righteousness, as we know, if we know any thing, characterizes many slaveholders in all relations but one ? Here is the great confusing snarl that needs to be disentangled. We have been puzzling ourselves with the inquiry, whether a slaveholder can be a Christian ; as if a man could not be a Christian in one part of his conscience, while another part is dark and sleepy as the hemisphere of earth or moon that is turned away from the sun. We know no better Christians, speaking generally, than some individuals who hold their brethren in bondage, daring as may be the avowal at the present day in this latitude. But is that saying they are Christians in every respect ? Far be it from us to indorse their whole character and conduct, or those of any one else. A dreadful blot is on them. God only

knows whether it penetrates to the heart. Those who believe in Christian perfectionism may reject this account. And yet perfect holiness need not involve infallibility of judgment. Unfortunately, at the South the doctrine of evangelical regeneration in the most absolute sense prevails, and the common idea is, that one who has been born of the Holy Ghost, whether he *can* do wrong or not, *will* not at any rate do so heinous a wrong as slaveholding is represented to be by Northern New-School Calvinists and Unitarians. If all that ultraists say of slavery be true, then slaveholding and Christianity cannot be united for a moment. Therefore their account of it is rejected at the South, for slaveholders are seen there who are universally regarded as Christians. They have felt the finger of God upon their hearts, and know whereof they affirm; and their neighbours believe them. Their first birth would be as soon questioned as their second. The inference is immediate, that what such good men do cannot be that monstrous mountain of malignity abolitionists talk of; and therefore abolitionists must be wrong, and Southern Christians must be right. So much for the violence of the crusade against the South. So much for judging men's hearts, and insisting that they must be rank with all corruption, because there has been an error in their lives.

And yet we hold to the truth of John Wesley's account of slavery, that it is "the sum of all iniquities"; but not necessarily iniquities of heart. The fact is, all such words are used in a double sense. They are applied to acts, and to motives. Slavery may be the sum of all iniquities in its effects, while its supporters think nothing about it. Have we not seen and read of many other sins united with undeniable virtues, from want of moral light? Immodesty with us makes a woman wholly reprobate; but is it so in the Polynesian islands? Slaveholding in Boston would betray a low moral state indeed; for our pure atmosphere pours light around most departments of conscience, and a spot is detected at once. But where the air is dark, the sight is dim. How was it with the Thugs of India? A multitudinous religious sect, faithfully practising many virtues within their body, and as faithfully robbing and murdering all they could out of it, — were they all self-condemned in this; — the little child whose first lessons were to do so conscientiously, and the old man who had grown gray in the

steady discharge of the perverse duty? Were there no amiable Thugs? As well say there have been no amiable and conscientious warriors. We like not war nor any of its works; but we know what has been the prevailing delusion of the world about the military profession, and have seen, that, where it is respected, its members are respectable in proportion, though their trade is cruelty; and *vice versâ*. In Old England, where a commission in the army or navy is almost a title of nobility, such a writer as Wordsworth even, with his pure moral tone and lofty seraphic soarings, could, within this present century, select "the Christian warrior" to depict as a model and embodiment of the Gospel graces. In New England, on the contrary, where "fanaticism" has torn off many of its laurels from the bloody sword, we have seen two small regiments raised, and kidnapped, as it were, into Mexico, by virtue of great drumming, and drinking, and drubbing; and how many of Wordsworth's "Christian warriors" enlisted in that *élite* corps of the Puritan States? How much will Mexico be edified by these our Miles Standishes of the nineteenth century? They are not as respectable men as the venerated soldier of the Mayflower was, because their profession has fallen into disesteem here, under present circumstances; "fallen," O, might we say, "like Lucifer, never to rise again"!

And how slavery shall be made to fall into disesteem, is the question. It is obvious that the natural mode of meeting the argument of those who infer its lawfulness from the Christian character of some slaveholders is, to show them that we can be better Christians without it; and so much better, that Christianity with it, a slaveholding Christianity, is to a Christianity of universal justice and benevolence less than a parhelion to a sun.

To do this, we must evince the wisdom that is "pure and peaceable," as well as "full of mercy and good fruits." The law of kindness must be on our tongues as readily as in our hands. This is necessary, too, in order to satisfy another class of objectors, those who fear insurrection as the fruit of antislavery agitation. Happy it is, and seemingly like a special providence, that the prominent abolitionists should be all peace men by profession. Only it is a pity that peace men should be so full of fight, so pugnacious, on every chance of logomachy, with that little member which an apostle designated as "a fire, a world of iniquity, which



defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and is set on fire of hell." Pity that non-resistants should ever substantiate their title to the name by neglecting to resist the angry promptings of their own tempers. Though it be only words they use, yet such loud words may naturally enough frighten the timid, and guilt is especially timid. They may talk loud, because they are earnest in meditating thoughts of love; but such obstreperous love-making does not suit weak nerves. They cannot persuade the South that their thoughts are turned on peace, when their boisterous voice seems still for war. The South feels like the keeper of a powder-magazine, when a keg or two of powder have burst open, and he is standing up to the ankles in it. It being dark, his affectionate neighbour runs to enlighten him out of the predicament with a blazing brand, which he waves to and fro fiercely to fan and spread the light. He of the magazine shrieks in terror, — "Avaunt, and for Heaven's sake shake not that brand with such rough energy here, lest sparks be scattered!" "O, make yourself perfectly easy!" cries he of the brand; "I come in love, and not to harm you. I do not intend to scatter sparks; I wave the torch only to throw light upon your steps, and extricate you from the powder before it explodes in spontaneous combustion." "As well kill a person," said some ancient Mrs. Partington, "as frighten him to death." Barking dogs, though they do not bite, are alarming to the sensitive, — exceedingly annoying, to say the least. Therefore let us not urge our love upon the slaveholder so as to terrify him and make him suspect we are expressing it rather to the slave under his foot, while we pretend it is meant for himself. Let us always address the white man, never his victim, on this subject, and avoid even the appearance of talking at the latter while we talk to the former. This may seem more insidious, and quite as alarming as the direct inculcation of "treason, stratagem, and spoils."

We should pursue a conciliatory course still more for the sake of another and the last class of Southrons we shall mention. These are the antislavery party of the South. For the North is mistaken in supposing the South all proslavery, as the South mistakes in supposing the North all antislavery. There is a small number of individuals there, — it cannot be called a party, for in most of our Barbary States they are obliged to keep as still as mice, and dare not peep, or mutter, or breathe to one another loud enough for any thing

like association or organization, or, indeed, to make themselves and their number known. They may be more numerous than any one thinks. They might run up to a pretty respectable minority in some of the States, if they ever dared to ask themselves for a categorical answer as to what they are in the matter. At any rate, the slaveholders know that the non-slaveholding voters in some States are the majority, and a majority suffering variously from the supremacy of the interests of the minority ; and therefore they are very careful to hush up instantly every voice that begins to sound forth any thing but "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." For what if it should come out that there was a considerable party of solid voters so profane as to feel no great respect for Diana ? What if a "real live" majority should be for laying sacrilegious hands on the said Diana, and toppling her divinityship from her pedestal ? Chaos would have come again. There might be some hope of such a result, if there could be a beginning of a manifested tendency to it. One man allowed to preach emancipation would be an opening wedge, and many might follow him. But the difficulty is to begin. Who will first volunteer to bell the cat, and make profession of the obligation of honesty ? Whoever does is summarily hustled out of the community, and he finds himself with his face to the north star, moving under as undesirable a necessity as marked the egress of one of our Commonwealth's ambassadors from Charleston, and the hegira of the other from New Orleans. The cat decidedly objects to being belled. What is to be done with such an unaccommodating humor ? We must try and convince grimalkin that the design is not so incendiary as he thinks, but is a peaceful, sweet-tempered, amiable design, aiming at his benefit as much as any one's ; and that, at any rate, all that is wanted is to shake tongues, not swords, and to shed ink, not blood, to explode prejudice, not gunpowder, and to hear reports of committees, not of cannon. Let all abolitionists protest this in a suitable tone of voice and expression of face and gesture and whole demeanour, so as to insure belief, and perhaps after a while the feline suspiciousness will be soothed, and vigilance be put at least into a cat-sleep ; and if an extinguisher is still put upon the voice that peeps, and a stopper into the ear that listens, it may be done loosely, so that some sounds will creep through, and after a while extinguisher and stopper fall off. Then we may perhaps see the beginning of the end.

It is all-important to secure the safety and influence of this little band in the lion's den ; for if emancipation ever takes place, it must begin through them. They are on the spot, they know the ground and its capabilities, they are always watching the enemy's strategy and tactics ; they must always be the van of the march, the fore-front of the battle, yea, the edge of the chisel, the lip of the gouge, the first tooth of the saw, the bearing-point of the antislavery auger. Generous sympathy and admiration for this little forlorn hope in its exposure should be enough to commend to us the course needful to secure their safety, even if it did not exactly coincide, as it does, with the course needful to enlarge their influence and invigorate their efficiency. This is the course of pacific inoffensiveness as far as may be consistent with our object, striving to remove prejudice against us from the minds of our opponents, and conciliate their tolerance to us, as the very first and indispensable preliminary to the most remote hope of their sympathy in any time to come. We should take warning from the resolutions the free negroes in Southern cities have sometimes felt obliged to pass, protesting against the violent action of their Northern friends.

The field being thus clear for labor, the next question is, What shall be its form and instrumentality ? Two modes, and various instruments under each, offer themselves to us, — antislavery action, in which we may be able to do little, and abstinence from proslavery action, by which we may effect a great deal, and more than we think, in a way to which no one can object.

First, we can exert some small positively antislavery influence. We meet with Southern men in interesting relations. We go to them. They come to us. We sustain the mutual and double relation expressed so pointedly by a single word in Greek and Latin, — though modern tongues want it, — *ξένος*, *Hospes*. By all this going to and fro knowledge should be increased. When the heart is warmed with generous hospitality, we may drop a word as large as a grain of mustard-seed and as soft as thistle-down, which may take root and grow, although the subject is generally a *tabooed* one. There are some reasonable beings from the South. Warburton used to say, that "when man was defined as a reasoning animal, it only meant that he was an animal capable of reason, though even that was rather a matter of tradition than of experience." But we can testify that we have

encountered soft-spoken men from the land of chivalric Hot-spurs, who were willing to exercise the distinguishing human faculty. Not all assume that the earth was made for them alone. Not all assert their right by nature to the best rooms in the hotel and the highest seats at the feast, and draw dirks on remonstrating waiters putting in a plea for the ladies. Not all invariably speak of "the Yankees" with an emphatic monosyllabic epithet prefixed to that nasal euphonism. Only we must be most guardedly polite, if we would win their ear rather than their fist. Perhaps it would be better to drop the English language for the nonce, and speak the *Slaveholderese*. Conform to their ideas as much as we can. Stoop to conquer. Give them many of their postulates, and yet we can beat them at the argument. Many an *ad hominem* thrust will do the business. The temptation is very great to combativeness, no doubt. Some of the things that they will say will be almost irresistibly provocative to a little sharp jocosity at least ; but it can be choked down. We remember coming upon a Southern gentleman, a few years ago, as he was coolly fixing up, in the most crowded part of State Street (the said State Street being the principal thoroughfare of Boston, which is in Massachusetts, and the principal city of New England), an advertisement for his runaway slave ; who, being brought by him to the Tremont House, chose to avail herself of a privilege which the constitution and laws allowed her ; that is, to take a walk without asking any one's permission. The Southron seemed to feel that he was doing rather a laudable act in affixing to a Bostonian's house that advertisement, inviting and calling upon all good citizens of the free North to violate law for his pleasure, and kidnap and enslave a free woman, — free now by the law of man as well as by the less important law of God. He assumed at once that he had our sympathy and approbation. "You must all assist," said he ; "this is a matter in which you are all interested." We did not answer, — "Yes, we are all interested in doing justly and loving mercy ; we are all interested in obeying the command of justice and of God, — 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee : he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best : thou shalt not oppress him.' " We did not answer in any such words, difficult as it was to deny ourselves the pleasure. We had grace to keep our lips



sealed ; and therefore we conclude it may be given to man to be good-natured even facing a slaveholder near Faneuil Hall.

As for the plan of putting all in Coventry who dwell south of Mason and Dixon's line, we may do that when we put in Coventry all the sinners who dwell north of it. No, no ; we should be a little afraid ourselves of the operation of this Coventry plan. We have no wish to see the community converted into a monastery of La Trappe, only not permitted so much as to cross the arms over the breast and say to one another, — "*Rappelez vous, mon frère, qu'il faut mourir.*" We wish to remind our slaveholding brother that he is to die, and we wish the admonition to be taken kindly, that it may have effect, and therefore we will not keep him in Coventry all day till the hour comes to explode a lecture upon him. If he be an unmitigated villain in his slaveholding, as some are, using that instrumentality for vices and meannesses not countenanced by the standard of slaveholding morality, then into Coventry with him quickly, and his brethren will assist to put him there ; as we do here to a Northern man who abuses too outrageously any power the law confers on him. But if a man here keep within the law and within the license of public sentiment, though they both allow many unchristian practices, and he indulges in them, it is idle to talk of *Coventrying* such a man. It cannot be done. A Christian might as well propose to Coventry an unfortunate Turk for having his full allowance of four legal wives, or a Turk a Christian for drinking wine at the Communion.

Proceeding in this spirit, we would say to our Southern brethren : — " We all have our misfortunes, and our faults. We are sensible that we of the North have our share, and we will thank you to alleviate for us the former and point out the latter. It is what we wish to do for you in the spirit of duty and meekness. You were born under a terrible burden. A portentously black and disastrous cloud hangs over you. We do not stigmatize you for that, as we do not expect you to reproach us for our frosty sky and rocky soil. But we offer to assist in drawing off the lightning from your cloud ; and we would be glad if you could soften our climate and our rocks. We will force upon you no measures respecting your own affairs contrary to your wishes ; but, as our affairs cannot but be affected by yours, — for we are one

people, — we entreat you, for the sake of all parties, suffer us to solicit your attention to evils you refuse to see. We know it must be because you cannot see the evils we allude to, that you tolerate their existence among you. Your sight is weak, and we cannot blame you for that. Custom has familiarized enormities till their atrocity makes no impression. We none of us see ourselves and the peculiarities of our lot as others see. Hear, then, the opinion held of your condition, not by us alone of these Northern States of our Union, but by the whole civilized world. Is not almost the whole Christianized globe bearing testimony against slavery, as an institution that has been long weighed in the balance and everywhere found wanting in good influences, physical or moral? We do not deny that it coexists among you with many interesting virtues, which it has not yet blighted. But travellers already say you are not what you were in former years. Even the accomplishments and light social graces which you used to attribute to this institution are vanishing from among you. The polished manners and elegant tastes of your fathers are passing to other parts of the country. The hospitality, the generosity, the gallant fearlessness, the frank open-heartedness, the gay, careless spirits that have characterized the South, belong to other circumstances in your lot rather than to injustice and oppression. These must always, in some degree, weigh down the heart and conscience. If slavery created all your virtues, still it makes you pay too dear a price for all the good its most enthusiastic advocates ever have pretended it could possibly occasion.

“Southern friends, we love to dwell upon your excellences. Your romantic fervors kindle a generous glow in our cold Northern imaginations. Your self-forgetting, headlong chivalry we can admire, with all our prudence and cautiousness. These very virtues, characteristic of the generous South, convince us that your toleration of slavery must be from thoughtlessness and inattention. You do not examine it, you do not see it as it is. You have seen it too long for that. You have known it too long to know any thing about its essential character, as it appears to the eyes of the unprepossessed and impartial. You would be the last people in the world to establish such an institution, if it were now to be established for the first time. Believe that. Only ask yourselves if you would be the people to go and enslave another nation, all being free till then. Most of you would disdain

to do it now, familiar as is the idea. How many of you would not feel it to be morally wrong, as well as socially debasing, to ply the cruel arts of the Guinea trader? And an institution which it would be so horrible to establish can you with unbroken complacency maintain?

“ You yourselves despise and abhor a hard and cruel slave-master; for we are not speaking to these inhuman exceptions from your general character, but to you who still deserve the name of men. You are shocked at what you term brutal atrocities against your dependents. These, being unusual, that is, exceeding the usual measure of severity to which you are accustomed, strike you as being cruelties. But the difference is only in degree. They are accordant and homogeneous parts of one system. The spirit is the same. Strangers unaccustomed to the lower degree of severity, that which you consider necessary and reasonable, shudder at it as you do at the higher and unnecessary, which you call wantonness and malignity in punishment. We have seen some of you, before you were well broken into it, decline the sight of the common whipping-post, and even the fields in which your negroes were laboring, leaving all the discipline of your plantations to your overseers and drivers. You could not bear to see blood flow, though a daily occurrence. If such tenderness were honorable, oh, how is it that you can quietly permit, can complacently know, that torments are endured by men and women which you cannot so much as bear to look upon? How can you sit and read so tranquilly some luxurious volume amidst couches, and cushions, and curtains, or preside serenely over your costly feasts, while you are doing by the hands of another a deed from which your own hands would fall powerless with disgust and loathing, if they attempted it? Is it not true, as well as legal, *Qui facit per alium facit per se*? Better do it with your own hands than leave these poor creatures, whom Providence has made dependent on you for protection, to the uncontrolled passions of irresponsible overseers, a proverbial set of petty, ignorant, and vulgar tyrants, in whom generally there is no mercy.

“ You do not think much of these things, and therefore you repeat, from father to son, — ‘ The slaves are happy; no more comfortable peasantry in the world.’ If you would but fix your eyes and hearts thoughtfully on a single point or two of the system, separating your own interest and preju-

dices from them by a momentary effort of mind, viewing them abstractly and as if for the first time in your life, the scales might drop from your eyes. Take, then, one phenomenon by itself, and, as you view it all around, steadfastly bear in mind what is the character Southern gentlemen assume to be their marked and peculiar glory. Look at a scene that occurs often enough, God knows, and say, What think you of gallant, chivalric men whipping women to make them work and support those lazy men in idleness? Viewed abstractly and apart from your own concern in it, would you not say immediately, under all the impulses of Southern gentlemen, that there could be no more ineffable meanness than this under the cope of heaven? Here is every element of the gallant cavalier violated. We unchivalric roundheads and rustics of the Puritan North could not sink to a less heroic achievement. You do not think, you do not know, what you are doing. How many more horrid features there may be in your institution, which you might see, if you tried hard to break the spell of custom and self-partiality!

“Suppose there were no cruelty in slavery, save as injustice is always cruelty; suppose there were no scourges, no stocks, no iron-collars, no guns and bloodhounds, not even fox-hounds turned into man-hounds, no public as well as private whipping-houses, termed often, in unfeeling mockery, ‘sugar-houses,’ passers by which can attest, that, at all hours,

*‘Hinc exaudiri gemitus, et sæva sonare*

*Verbera: tum stridor ferri, tractæque catenæ’;*

yet can you, men of the nicest sense of honor as you are, who feel a stain like a wound, and would rather die, and put your dearest friend to death, than have your probity impeached, can you live long lives in peace of mind with injustice your constant stigma, with dishonesty staining every cent you receive or spend? Is it not unjust to make a good man another’s chattel? Then is it not unjust to keep him so? Do not an innocent man’s limbs belong to himself? Then how is it not dishonesty to take away from him the labor of his limbs; and common, ungentle, vulgar dishonesty as any, the moment we look through the thin surface of a most shallow prejudice? Your slaves say they wish to be free. We never heard one say otherwise out of his master’s hearing, in twenty years’ intercourse with them. That is their strange preference; and that should be enough to decide you how to act. It may be a foolish choice in them.



'They may be perverse, having had experience in the matter, in not believing the rhapsodies uttered on the advantages of being a crushed and brutified chattel by your well-paid fiction-mongers, who seem to think that slavery, as Diderot says of that other enrapturing theme, woman, should be written upon, 'dipping our pen in the hues of the rainbow, and using for dust the down of the butterfly's wing.' But their sufficient answer is, 'We don't like it.' And be assured, O Southern gentlemen, you would not like it either. With your tastes and indolence, you would be the last people on earth to like toiling in that burning sun of the reeking rice-swamp, under the cart-whip. Therefore you might feel for the congenial indolence and slumberous propensities of the children of Africa. By the constitution nature has given them, they hate work worse than any white man does.

"Southern friends, what will you lose by freedom? Not wealth; for slavery keeps you all in debt to the non-slaveholding North. Not polish and elegance, not generosity and magnanimity, not the graces and enjoyments that spring from the ascendancy of the powerful over the weak; for you would still be a landed aristocracy, and would live under the same physical influences as now. All the chivalry and honor and frankness and fearless adventurousness and exuberance of spirits would remain. Would you be less agreeably situated as gentlemen, if you approached more nearly to what you now boast has a partial resemblance in your social arrangements, namely, the condition of the European landed aristocracy, — living surrounded by your tenants, looking up to you with a gratitude for freedom, and a deference for multifarious superiority, such as are not felt by farmers abroad toward their landlords?

"Friends, this is no insidious proposal. There is not a man of you but we love. Some of us have been identified with you, and can feel for you as for our own flesh and blood. We who write this have sympathized with you in modes not always agreeable now to reflect upon, as we remember that fifty human beings were hung in a line for the winding up of a servile insurrection among you, which we were obliged to assist in suppressing. Yes; we rode patrol for you, night after night, through your streets and forests, — striking no blow, we are thankful, — but running down and incarcerating poor fugitives, whom we pitied from the bottom of our hearts. God forgive us, if we did wrong! but the terror of your women

and children was an appeal not be resisted. Never shall we forget the scenes we witnessed at the ringing of your alarm-bells. Therefore we can feel for you and appreciate all the difficulties of your position ; but, in view of them all, we decide that justice is the path of safety. That insurrection was plotted in '22, or rather, it was discovered then ; the plot commenced years before. This was before the abolition agitation. It is since then, and since the last considerable insurrection that has occurred, — that of Nat Turner, in Southampton, Virginia, — that we have begun to talk much of antislavery. Therefore the antislavery discussion here did not occasion those insurrections ; but, if it has had any effect, has prevented such outbreaks, for there have been none of late years. And this is what might be expected from the peaceful principles it breathes, and the hope it gives the slave that it will not be necessary for him to strike with the arm of flesh, since others are taking thought for him with bloodless and more effective weapons. Why should you be afraid, then, to talk of doing justice ? Why fear that justice will provoke the slave to massacre, instead of exciting his gratitude, when lifelong injustice has so seldom nerved him to revenge ?

“ Southrons, you are not apt to be afraid. You love the excitement of danger. You are pouring, with tumultuous delight, into the battle-fields of Mexico. One half of those who go there die, yet you shrink not. And will you be afraid of a few imaginary difficulties and dangers, all of which, put together and converted from shadows into realities, would not equal the fatigues and perils of one Buena Vista day ? *Festina lente* in the matter, if you think that best, but begin to make some movement. Be willing to *think*, at least, when justice, and honor, and common honesty, and chivalric intrepidity call for it.

“ We appeal to every consideration that should affect good and noble men, or wise and self-loving men. You are ruining the land you love ; you are impoverishing its resources ; you are putting a prohibition on enterprise, and thrift, and the dignity of labor ; and, what is worse, on the purest conscientiousness and the peculiar virtues of the Christian, where they transcend the virtues of the worldly cavalier. How many good men you have driven out from you, by making conscientiousness in one duty a crime ! They are afraid to stay, if they would be honest with themselves, and rise above

prejudice and interest. This class will increase now every year. There is no Edict of Nantz for them. If they would be faithful to conscience, they must become expatriated men. Was the revocation of that edict a wise measure for France, when it stripped her of so many valuable subjects, the *élite* of the Huguenot fearers of God, and drove them to settle on your shores? We plead for these exiles from the land of their birth. The banished child pines to return to his mother's breast. His fathers' sepulchres are among you. Those fathers bled to serve you and make you a free people. His mother sleeps under the sod of your valleys. She taught him, among her first lessons, to love his native land and make it a land of Christian righteousness. Let him come back to you with a clear conscience, that he may practise that lesson. Some of us who ventured to you from the North to preach Christ's Gospel you have driven away with indignity and outrage and a price upon our head, in violation of our civil rights, as well as the authority of God. We forgive all that; but we cannot so easily forgive your unfaithfulness to yourselves."

We do not see how we can refuse to say something like this, when we have the ear of our Southern friends favorable to us, and escape the charge of proslavery in both of the senses we have attributed to the word. We justified the sentiment so far as it meant *pro-slaveholder*, that is, love and kindness to him, as to all other men. But politeness is carried too far, if Chesterfield is set above Christ, and our being pro-slaveholder makes us anti-slave. We must never forget the slave, when conversing with his master. He is our perpetual client, and we should ever be watching for a chance to forward his cause prudently. A word dropped wisely in the *mollia tempora fandi* may be the seed of his freedom.

We hold that we are bound, too, to vote and legislate against this giant evil, to the utmost limit of our constitutional rights; and among those, we suppose, is even the right of changing the Constitution, if we find it desirable, and do it through constitutional forms. The stipulations of the national compact do not muzzle speech on any subject, nor prohibit self-defence, when the ever-growing encroachments of the slave power threaten our Northern rights and portend a slavery as the government of the Federal Union. A stiffer resistance than we have made would win respect, even at the South.

But, if we are allowed to do little by antislavery action, so much the more strenuously ought we to do all we can, by scorning to exert the smallest proslavery influence unnecessarily. It is unquestionably constitutional to keep the lips closed ; and silence sometimes may be almost omnipotent. We read in the book of Revelation, that "there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour" ; and a half-hour's silence on earth at the fitting season would do something to bring it nearer to heaven. In this matter we are grievously faulty. Who, while travelling in the South, has not often witnessed an eagerness in New-Englanders to speak favorably of an institution about which they supposed their opinion would be considered doubtful or adverse ? They volunteer their approbation. In coaches, and cars, and steamboats, if you see a man in ecstasy, be sure it is a Jonathan, delighted with his discovery that slavery is not the monster abolitionists have represented it. This is one of the mischiefs of their exaggerations. To hear some of their lecturers, one would receive the impression, that nothing was heard but lamentation, mourning, and woe over the wide savannas and cotton-fields of the South. On the contrary, the New-Englander finds it the land of gayety, compared with which his own has a sombre aspect. He sees slaves dancing in the streets to the music of the troops maintained expressly to keep them in subjection and march them to execution when uneasy. There are no such Momuses as the mindless children of Gallah and the Gold Coast. The moment punishment is over, their elastic spirits throw off the load of sadness, and they rise to joke about their stripes, perhaps while they wash out the brine that has been rubbed into their wounds to exacerbate the smart. Hearing this sonorous and incessant cachinnation, — not admitted into the privacies where discipline is administered, — feasted and flattered by the courtly masters, the New-England man thinks he has been imposed upon by the enemies of slavery. He does not allow for the peculiarity of the African temperament nor for the genial Southern clime, the very heat of which seems to exhilarate the black as much as it oppresses the white man. Then he hears that the slave is not required to accomplish as much labor as he himself exacts of his hired laborers at home, and he thinks they must have an easy life ; not considering the difference of the stimulus that incites them, and that free hope will do with pleasure ten times the work



slave-fear does with hate and curses. Hence Northern slaveholders are the most dreaded by the slave. They bring the free hyperborean's energy and ideas of labor with them, and expect the same from the sluggish, hopeless toiler near the tropics, and they naturally become impatient and irritated by dulness and slowness so uncongenial with their own activity ; and then comes punishment ; and hard and heavy fall the blows from those energetic, well-developed, Northern flexors and extensors. And because the lazy negro hates work, so that he suffers about as much from it as from the scourging, and therefore bears much scourging rather than do much work, our Northern man, who never has received a blow in his life, and shudders at the thought, supposes the negro does not feel, — he must be deficient in sensibility. " His skin is thick," writes a venerable Doctor of Divinity from the North, and publishes it in a religious newspaper of Boston. " It is all a mistake to feel so much compassion for the slaves. They are whipped, it is true ; but it does not hurt them much, their skins are so thick." We shall hear next, that it is rather an agreeable titillation of the epidermis, than otherwise. After this, we may believe the story Fraser tells, in his " Travels in Persia " ; that, hearing screams every day from a neighbouring house, he inquired into the cause, and was told that a rich merchant, knowing that his wealth would excite the cupidity of the Pacha, was preparing himself to resist his extortions by hardening his soles to the bastinado, and had already accustomed himself to bear daily a thousand strokes of the bamboo comfortably enough ; but more than that made him scream, and he was now upon his second thousand for the day, and begged to be excused for disturbing his neighbours. It may be that rich merchants prefer to undergo discipline into the second thousand, rather than bleed pecuniarily, and that negroes enjoy the excitement of their thick cuticles by a fustigation ; but if the recollections of our school days are anywhere in the neighbourhood of the truth, we were obtuse to such enjoyments and preferences.

We should make allowance, too, when we go South, for the cheerful and exhilarating excitement of travel. This produces an illusion which most travellers experience, though few detect and understand it. We attribute our own light-heartedness to the people among whom we travel. We are gay, because we have got away from care and business, are

changing the air, seeing new scenes, eating with appetite, and sleeping healthily, to wake to another day of zest to-morrow. The mind throws out its own bright coloring around. Those we meet seem as happy as ourselves. We are surprised, if they tell us they are not. We go to Italy for recreation and its pleasant excitements of climate and landscape, antiquities and arts, and we get the idea that it is a very cheerful country, and people cannot be unhappy there. But Italy is full of poverty and vice, overrun with cripples and beggars, soldiers and monks, denied the heart's best joys. Thousands sleep in its streets, for want of a shelter from the cold of winter and the more pestilent dews of summer. Can enjoyment be universal in such a country? So we go southward, feeling like escaped prisoners, like dismissed school-children. We leave the grave cares and tempers and climate of New England to hibernate in the sunny South among its mercurial children. We leave the Pilgrim State shrouded in snow and overcanopied with clouds; a few days' steaming sets us down among roses and jessamines, the air balmy and perfumed, the inhabitants enjoying their evening reunions in their open piazzas, under the clear moonlight of that cloudless sky. We are immediately received among them with the cordiality and hospitality of the idle in all warm climes. A few months pass away in easy socialities; health bounds more vigorous through our frames; every thing is provided for us; there is no housekeeping, and marketing, and regulating of bakers and milkmen and dustmen; till we have cut out the heart of the winter: and then we return, in what we by courtesy here call spring, and are received by the east wind, with all its horrors, and a gray sky, and the anxieties of our vocation, which has fallen into arrears during our absence, and requires harder work to bring up leeway. And we think, "How pleasant it was at the South! Every thing seemed to smile there. The African ivory was a type of joy. Better be a slave there than a freeman here. They have no care, those slaves" (meaning, we had none while we lived among them); "every thing is provided for them" (meaning, that every thing was provided for us while there). "Their whipping, after all, they don't feel much" (meaning, we did not feel it). "How they seemed to enjoy waiting upon us!" (meaning, that we enjoyed it). O New-Englander, disentangle these associations! for every word you speak thus, you add a rivet to your brother's chain.

It is worse, when public men, the eminent and the learned, teachers and statesmen and professional men, wend their way South to teach slaveholding to slaveholders. We will not say it is carrying coals to Newcastle, for what they carry gives neither light to the mind nor warmth to the heart ; but we might apply the corresponding proverb that was used by the ancients, and call it carrying owls to Athens. Alas, when Northern lawyers go to teach the claimants of man as property, that law can make any thing property, and the constitutions of men may supersede those of God and nature ! Alas, when Northern physicians go to lecture to the trampers on a race, that that race carries in its physical organization proofs of inferiority, and therefore destination to subjection ! Thrice alas, when the Northern herald of the religion of brotherhood goes to preach to the already too tyrannical, that one brother may be an oppressor and another his crouching slave, one an owner and the other the thing owned ! They preach this, perhaps, without wishing, without intending it, simply through want of the faculty of holding their tongues. Such doctrine is not required of them, any more than the opposite doctrine. They need say nothing about it. But the temptation is to say as much as they can with truth in favor of their hearers' prejudices, while they cannot say what would make against them ; and a half-truth leaves the same wrong impression as an untruth. A Southern congregation will sit from New Year's day to Christmas, and demand of the Northern Christian no pandering to its errors ; but, if it is told that Jesus never forbade slaveholding, it ought to be told, in the same connection, that he forbade injustice and inhumanity, and that the greater includes the less. Do clergymen open their lips to let out but half the truth from improper motives ? Not always, by any means. Do they thus send off their hearers with the impression that wrong is right, because every specific form of wrong is not forbidden in the Bible, from time-serving mercenariness ? Far be it from us to think so. The most amiable feelings may prompt to it, — good-natured courtesy, kindness to their hearers, the dislike to wound any one's feelings, gratitude and affection to friends from whom they are ever receiving tokens of good-will. Therefore we do not judge them harshly, but only beseech that they will learn to wield the omnipotence of silence. "There is a time to keep silence, and a time to speak," said Solomon, the wise

king, and was never wiser in saying any thing else. A time for the former, of special power, is in conversation, when an answer is expected from us to some remark implying, however indirectly, approbation of slavery. Seriously and deeply have we seen the slaveholder impressed, when such a remark was followed by sudden and absolute silence in one whom he respected. No pointed rejoinder may be better understood than this, nor taken half so well. It is an inoffensive and powerful resource, continually coming into play.

For, we repeat, the Southern Church is not offended at quietism on this subject in the recruits to its ranks from the Northern schools of the prophets. It will, like even the worst men, respect consistency. When it sends to us for a candidate, it does not expect to find him a Southern man born at the North. Its native clergy seldom utter the remotest allusion to the questionable institution in their preaching. We do not remember hearing the word Slave in some two thousand sermons that offered us soothing edification throughout half a dozen different slave States. When it is necessary to refer to such a topic, some very circuitous and delicate periphrasis is substituted ; but it is considered almost an indecorum not to ignore the whole matter as much as possible in the house of God. We do remember hearing most explicit charges and cautions addressed by Southern to Northern divines, against their unconsidered officiousness in tickling, as they supposed, the Southern ear. We have now distinctly in our mind an earnest remonstrance, urged, before a large party of laymen in Camden, South Carolina, by an experienced native divine, against the offer of a fresh clerical arrival to vindicate and eulogize slavery from the pulpit, as rich in blessings to all concerned in it. This new importation thought that even the foreign slave-trade might be commended as an instrument of Christian regeneration, a means of grace, rescuing the pagan from benighted Africa, and presenting to him the Christianity, enlightenment, and civilization, the intellectual, moral, and spiritual elevation of—a field-slave. The Carolinian could hardly restrain the Connecticut Doctor's enthusiasm. "It is true," said he, "we think a slaveholder may be a Christian in his heart ; but yet let us not preach to panegyryze slavery. Our next neighbour is a drunkard, who seems otherwise to be a Christian in his heart. Will you preach to panegyryze drunkenness ?"

It is these things that explain the sneers so common in the



South at Northern philanthropy. They throw a doubt over all its pretensions, as endowed with a wonderful cosmopolitan tact for accommodating itself to every latitude. The South idolizes manliness and independence. While it would hate and dread and respect sincere, self-sacrificing abolitionism, it thoroughly despises sycophancy. It scorns, more than every other, the New England parasite. From foreign despotisms and aristocracies it can receive proslavery accessions without wonder. When Prince Murat came to buy a plantation and work negroes in Florida, it seemed natural enough. When the present excellent Bishop of South Carolina asked him if he had no scruples about slavery, and he answered, that he did "not believe men had any abstract rights, the right of power was all," it seemed the appropriate sentiment from the son of a military king and usurper. But when the Bay State men, the Granite, the Green Mountain State republicans, who have stood upon the rock of Plymouth, and heard yearly eulogy on their Pilgrim fathers, come to bolster up a system of oppression which even the Barbary States on the Mediterranean are getting ashamed of, it does excite special wonder that these should be the kindred of the men who fought at Naseby and Marston Moor, and Lexington and Bunker's Hill.

Whether our preachers should settle over Southern churches, in the present condition of things, is a question on which there will long yet be difference of opinion. They can do so without adopting the prevailing opinions, if they will keep quiet on them, and preach against sin in general, and for holiness in general. After they have secured their foothold, they may let it be known with impunity that they are privately opposed to slavery, and perhaps exercise a faint influence against it, and a strong influence in ameliorating the condition of the slaves around them. But their position seems to countenance error, and they will be, in various ways, ill at ease, especially after their children begin to grow old enough to drink in the spirit of slavocracy.

Whether our clergy here should admit to their pulpits those who have bowed the knee to the Southern Baal, it is of little consequence how we determine, if it be explicitly understood that their admission is no indorsement of their errors. But if we should close the door to such, they would have no right to complain; for they have commenced the exclusive system themselves. All who are known to have spoken for the op-

pressed here are now shut out from the Southern pulpit. We can give the same reason for the exclusion that they can. If we have meddled with their institution, so have they with ours. Theirs is slavery ; ours is liberty for all.

Neither has any one a right to object, if we rather decline intimate relations with those between whom and us there is so pervading an uncongeniality on a momentous and absorbing subject. We would treat them kindly, whenever we can serve them ; but it would be a proslavery course, to prefer and select them for our companions. Our acquaintance must have limits, and we do no wrong to the multitude outside of its limits. The Irish population in the same cities with us take no offence at the broad line of separation between them and the natives ; and it will be more and more the case, that the champions of freedom and the advocates of slavery walk apart. Let neither party frown or feel slighted. They are equally remote from one another. What hundreds of men there are that we venerate, but never speak to ! Our tastes are different.

The great question remains, How much should clergymen here preach on the subject ? One who, in the present state of the question, gives all its aspects the go-by, as he does tyrannicide, and witchcraft, and crimes obsolete and impossible to us, will not escape the charge of proslavery. He must utter his testimony distinctly, and often enough to have it entirely understood on which side he stands. The more distinctly, the less often will be necessary ; and he must not reserve it as a bitter pill for the Fast-Day or Thanksgiving, when there will be no one to swallow it. We should not wish it presented to ourselves from the pulpit as frequently, by any means, as more solemn and devotional themes. The Sabbath was made for man, but chiefly for man to realize his relations to God. No general rule can be given, except it be this, — that such testimony is needed in proportion as it is resisted ; and in that same proportion is prudence needed in uttering it. Let it not be forced ; let it not vex the dull ears of drowsy men, a *crambe repetita usque ad nauseam*. Most fatal mistake, when the preacher assumes a pugnacious attitude to his hearers, and forgets that “the wrath of man never worketh the righteousness of God” ! Better assume that he has not a proslavery man before him ; that they are all anti-slavery, of course, in this latitude, — if they only understood themselves, — all of one mind already ; and that he introduces

the subject, not so much to effect conversions, as to "stir up their pure minds, by way of remembrance" of what they have long since believed.

If any one objects to a preacher's doing so much as this, he will, of course, take to himself the title of proslavery ; and then we are not addressing him. We write to those who would know what is necessary to escape that title. That any one, North or South, should say that a teacher of the religion of Jesus does wrong in warning his young men — scores of whom are going South every winter — against the peculiar moral dangers into which they go, seems to us passing strange. It would be as reasonable to object to a Southern father's or guardian's reminding the generous youth under his charge, about to come this way, that among the Yankees are shrewd and enterprising speculators, given to paying attentions to the unwary, and the boys would better examine carefully the nutmegs they buy ; or that there exists here a cruel prejudice against the dark-skinned races, and the young men must be on their guard and not imbibe a disposition to deride and insult, as well as enslave, the companions and playfellows of their childhood. Bitter as is slavery's draught, this intense contempt for the negro would make the bondman's burden unspeakably more intolerable. As the young New-Englander who goes to the South carries this ingrained prejudice with him, predisposing him in any way to trample on those he already shuns and despises, it is the more necessary to warn him against the temptations to unrighteousness it will so fearfully augment. But slavery is a concise, short-hand symbol for all immorality. Now, what father may not admonish his son against the various forms of immorality separately, by their respective names ? What pastor, then, who is a spiritual father to the young of his flock, may not do the same ? And if he may do it in many words, may he not in one ? May he not use a comprehensive term, instead of spending his breath needlessly in wearisome diffuseness ? Stenography is not forbidden to the pulpit ; nor are precision and point often complained of in it. The young man warned will remember one word, where he would not a dozen ; and a comprehensive expression for a comprehensive iniquity — yea, "the sum of all iniquities" (we thank Wesley for teaching us that word) — will have a force proportioned to its succinctness. No advice is needed but this : — "Avoid all practices connected with slavery."

We close, hoping that we leave this comprehensive advice emphatically impressed upon the reader. Yes, slavery is the fertile mother of abominations. But if it were nothing but loss of liberty, if it included no other cruelty, what slave has not shown a burning passion for liberty, as itself, at any price, the paramount blessing of life? This sentiment is the handwriting of God on every human heart. Dryden has truly said, —

“O, give me liberty!

For, were even a paradise itself my prison,  
Still I should long to leap the crystal walls.”

M. I. M.

---

ART. V.—LIFE OF DR. BELKNAP.\*

“THE life of a modest man,” said Miss Lucy Aikin, speaking of the memoir of a cherished friend, which she was anxiously expecting, “should be modestly written”; and could Dr. Belknap himself have designated his biographer, he could not have selected one who would more appropriately have performed the task. It is a graceful, unpretending tribute from filial hands to an honored ancestor. Its chief merit is the judicious arrangement of letters and documents, furnished, for the most part, from his own writings; and we welcome, after the interval of half a century which has elapsed since his death, these memorials of one who, as an historian and a man of letters, as a faithful clergyman and a wise philanthropist, was among the distinguished men of his times.

Dr. Belknap was born in Boston, June 4, 1744, and graduated at Harvard College in 1762. While preparing for the ministry, he engaged in the instruction of youth; and at Milton, where for two years he was master of the public school, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and in other places where he taught, he left lasting remembrances of himself as a skilful, affectionate, and successful teacher. “He was one” of those, says his biographer, “whom companions and

---

\* *Life of Jeremy Belknap, D. D., the Historian of New Hampshire; with Selections from his Correspondence and other Writings.* Collected and arranged by his GRANDDAUGHTER. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1847. 18mo. pp. 254.



friends not only love, but reverence, at an early age." As a proof of the sincerity of his character and of his benevolent desire to serve those around him in any way in his power, she adduces part of a letter, written shortly after he was graduated, to a young friend at Cambridge who had requested his aid in composing a theme on the immortality of the soul. The theme was sent, but with it the following gentle admonition : —

"Though I shall never be loth to serve you in the same manner, yet I cannot recommend it to you to pursue this method, but wish that you would endeavour to acquire a better talent at composition. It would be an unspeakable advantage to you. Do not let your genius lie uncultivated, and your abilities be any longer dormant, but only put them once into action, and they will continue to supply you with whatever you want in this way with the greatest ease. I speak experimentally." — p. 14.

His entrance on the ministry was not without painful scruples and distrust as to his spiritual qualifications. In a letter to his great-uncle, the well-known Mather Byles, he thus expresses his perplexities : —

"It is a fixed and settled opinion with me, that no person ought to take on him the office of a minister of the Gospel, unless he has experienced the renovating power of it on his own soul ; but, unhappy me ! I have never experienced this, and therefore I dare not preach, though I have been much urged to it." — p. 15.

We have seen nothing of Dr. Byles which has pleased us more, or given a more agreeable view of his character, than his reply to this letter, in which he seeks to relieve the difficulties of his young friend, and to encourage his entrance upon the profession of his choice.

"I am pleased," says he, "to see your regards to the work of the ministry. 'T is what you choose.' And why do you choose it ? Perhaps answering this very question to yourself may relieve your anxious heart." — p. 17.

When at length these scruples were overcome, and he had relinquished a plan, which under their influence he had formed, of devoting himself to the instruction of the Indians, Mr. Belknap accepted the unanimous invitation of the people of Dover, New Hampshire, to become their pastor, and was ordained February 18, 1767.

In this place he labored, amidst great discouragements, for

more than nineteen years ; fulfilling all the duties of a faithful minister, honorably known and frequently employed on occasions of public interest in other churches, and in various parts of the State ; and at the same time, with the skilful industry which was always one of his characteristics, collecting materials for those valuable works which have given him so wide a reputation as an historian and biographer. Among his best friends and parishioners was Thomas W. Waldron, one of the most influential men in Dover. On the friendship and judgment of this gentleman he confidently relied ; and, " being very modest in estimating his own powers," and willing to be guided by friendly counsel, he addressed to him a letter, at the commencement of his historical researches, which, when we consider his subsequent success in this department, cannot be read without the interest which, as has been remarked by another, " we naturally feel with regard to all the circumstances of a distinguished man's preparation for his future eminence." \*

" SIR, — You cannot help having observed in me an inquisitive disposition in historical matters. I find it so strong and powerful, and withal so increasing with my opportunities for gratifying it, that it has become a question with me, whether I might not freely indulge it, with a view to the benefit of my fellow-men, as well as for my own improvement. As it is natural for us to inquire into the ancient state and circumstances of the place of our own abode, and to entertain a peculiar fondness for such inquiries in preference to more foreign matters, so I have applied myself, in some leisure hours (making it of late my principal amusement), to learn what I can from printed books and manuscripts, and the information of aged and intelligent persons, of the former state and affairs of this town and province.

" The knowledge I have yet obtained is at present very imperfect ; but I find a disposition to pursue it with a view to the collecting some memoirs which may, in future time, after much reviewing and correcting by myself and others, be made public.

" I desire you would speak freely ; and if you think my age, or abilities, or circumstances as a minister, or opportunities for collecting fit materials, or any other matters, are objections against my undertaking it, I shall immediately give up all thoughts of making public any thing of the kind, and shall confine myself entirely to my own amusement.

" July 17th, 1772."

pp. 47, 48.

---

\* Thacher's Life of Buckminster.

But while Dr. Belknap was faithfully serving his people, he was kept in perpetual embarrassment by their unfaithfulness in the payment of his salary. His pursuits were interrupted and his spirit harassed by his domestic necessities ; and, after long and patient endurance, he finally determined to leave Dover, his connection being dissolved in September, 1786. He was thus for a season "thrown upon the world with a family to support, and only his own powers of mind to depend upon for subsistence. He bore his trials with great fortitude. He did not speak harshly of those who had shown themselves so unworthy ; very few of his friends were made acquainted with his difficulties ; and even to his own children, then and in after years, he was always silent on the subject."

But his excellent gifts were not long to remain unemployed. On leaving Dover, he addressed a letter to President Willard of Harvard College, informing him that he was again a candidate for the ministry, and bespeaking his friendly influence. "I wish," he writes, "to be serviceable to the best interests of mankind, and to be still employed in the vineyard, if the Lord of it shall appoint me a place." And having preached for a few months in Exeter, Beverly, and other vacant parishes, some of which would gladly have appropriated his services, he accepted a cordial invitation from the church in Federal Street (then Long Lane), in Boston, which had just before relinquished the Presbyterian for the Congregational order, and was installed as their pastor on the 4th of April, 1787. To this new and pleasant field of duty he was welcomed by the cordial congratulations and hopes of his brethren and friends, who had sympathized in his previous trials, and well knew his large capacities for usefulness. Boston, as it was his native place, was also his appropriate sphere. Here he found both professional and literary associates, of whom were Minot, Clarke, Eliot, Kirkland, and Freeman, whose society supplied a want which he had sensibly experienced in Dover. Here he could devote himself, without painful anxiety, to his favorite pursuits ; and from his deep interest in the education of youth, he was signally useful as a member of the School Committee of the town, and as an Overseer of the College. "He took much pains," says his granddaughter, "to procure the publication of suitable books for the young ; and his services in their cause are remembered by some now living, who, as

children, were won by the kindness and attraction of his manner, and who speak of him with a warmth of feeling which nothing but a conviction of his sympathy and love for them could have preserved through the trials and changes of so many intervening years." Of his fidelity as a pastor, and of his personal excellence, we cannot adduce a clearer testimony than that borne by the Rev. Dr. Kirkland, in the sermon preached at his funeral.

"You are witnesses what is lost, no less in private conduct and example, than in public ministrations; how well his life became his doctrine, how the divine, moral, and social virtues appeared in him in the various scenes of life, in the hours of adversity, and in his intercourse with his people. You are witnesses how kind and inoffensive, yet how plain and sincere, was his demeanour, how useful was his conversation, how simple and unaffected were his manners. The sick are witnesses of his attention, his fidelity and tenderness in comforting the believing, in warning the sinner, and confirming the doubtful. The unreasonable and censorious are witnesses of his patience and indulgence; the unbelieving, of his desire to convince them; the afflicted and despondent, of the sweetness of his consolations and his gentle encouragement; the poor, of his ready advice and assistance, and, to the extent of his abilities, his alms; the rich, of his Christian independence, united with a becoming complaisance; and the profligate, of his grief for their depravity, of his utter disapprobation of their characters."

In no notices of Dr. Belknap may we omit his literary distinction, or some reference to the works on which it is founded. His *History of New Hampshire*, in three volumes, the first of which appeared in 1784, and his *American Biography*, which he lived not to complete, have long since given him a place among the eminent scholars and writers of our country. Nor does his reputation rest on these alone. Besides some occasional sermons,\* creditable to his professional character, he published several essays and dissertations on a variety of topics, literary, political, and religious. His humane and philanthropic spirit disposed him to take a lively interest in whatever promised to benefit society or his race. Both for the suppression of the slave-trade and for the advancement of temperance he was earnestly engaged;

---

\* Among these are an Election Sermon preached before the Legislature of New Hampshire, in 1784, and a Sermon before the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers, in 1796.



contributing his enlightened aid in every way in which he thought he might do service. To him belongs the honor of founding the Massachusetts Historical Society. The first plan of the institution was drawn by his hand ; he identified himself with all its objects ; carried on an extensive correspondence over the country, to enlist prominent individuals in its design ; and wrote valuable articles, the results of his own investigations, for its volumes.\*

The religious opinions of Dr. Belknap were in accordance with the moderation and catholicism of his whole spirit. They were formed at a period when much was supposed to be held in common by Christians of various names, and before the distinctions which have since been insisted on with more vehemence than charity had been made. From some remarks "in relation to the opinions of Dr. Watts," incorporated with the present volume, it might be inferred, that, on the subject of the Trinity, he approved of the views, essentially Unitarian, which were well known to have been entertained by that eminent divine before his death. "I do not apprehend," says he, "that it is incumbent on me to defend it [Watts's notion of the Trinity], nor am I sanguine in my opinion that it is the true one ; though I confess, that, in the main, it appears to me at present to be nearer the truth than that commonly received as orthodox, which maintains three *real persons*, or distinct intelligent beings, in the Godhead." "As to Arians, properly so called," he afterwards remarks, "if I have any idea of their sentiments, they consider the *Logos* and the *Holy Spirit* as created beings ; which I think, with Dr. Watts, is an error most manifestly repugnant to Scripture doctrine." On some disputed topics he seemed willing to adopt phraseology, as is seen particularly in his Collection of Psalms and Hymns, which would now be thought scarcely reconcilable with the general character of his faith. But Dr. Belknap had no taste for controversy ; and, however much attached to his own, condemned no man for differing from him in opinion.

---

\* Among his correspondents, both for the Historical Society and for aid in his History of New Hampshire, we find Governor Wentworth, for many years the upright and honored chief-magistrate of that State, and afterwards, removing to the British Provinces, rewarded for his loyalty by being made governor of Nova Scotia. The correspondence is honorable to both parties. Governor Wentworth had a high esteem for the talents, learning, and character of Dr. Belknap, and, in a very interesting letter, preserved in this memoir, urges him to take charge of the education of a favorite nephew.

"They," said he, "who have investigated subjects of doctrinal controversy with the greatest care and impartiality will be the most ready to confess that there are difficulties on all sides, where the Scripture has not explicitly decided; and will see the greatest reason for diffidence of themselves, and candor towards one another. These are two principal lessons which I have learned from the study of more than thirty years, and these I am principally solicitous to inculcate upon others. If this publication should in any degree contribute to answer this end, I shall be thankful, though it should expose me to the censures of some good men, to whose esteem I am by no means indifferent, though their charity is much more confined than my own; and whom, whatever they may think or say of me, I will love and honor." — p. 253.

At the time of Dr. Belknap's call to the church in Boston, "some person, who was apparently annoyed by the change in the church government, and by the liberal views of the chosen pastor, tried to persuade the brethren of the church that he was a Universalist and a follower of Murray; and to this end an anonymous letter was written to one of the deacons"; which, having been shown to Mr. Belknap, he immediately communicated the fact to the committee of the Society, and with a commendable frankness presented "a declaration of his own sentiments," from which we take a passage that will be read with interest at the present time.

"When the Chauncy controversy came abroad, which engaged every body's attention more or less, it was natural for me to incline to one side or the other. I was inclined to call in question the immortality of the wicked in a state of future punishment, though I had no doubt of the certainty of the punishment. There are difficulties attending the subject on every side in which it can be viewed; and after much thought upon the matter, I am inclined to this opinion, that the revelation which God has given us in the Scriptures is intended to regulate our present conduct in this world, and to give us to understand what will be the consequences, in the future state, of our good and bad behaviour here.

"I believe the resurrection of the just and the unjust; that the life which the just shall receive from Christ, at their resurrection, will be immortal; and that they shall never die any more; but doubt whether it can be proved from the Scriptures that the life which the wicked shall receive at their resurrection is immortal, — if it can, it will follow that their misery will never end; but am rather inclined to think that the life which they will then

receive will be a *mortal life*, that they will be subject to a series of misery and torment, which will terminate in a *second death*. Whether this second death is an utter extinction of being, or whether they will be delivered from it by another resurrection, are points which I cannot determine, nor do I think the Scriptures afford us full satisfaction on these subjects ; so that I expect no full solution in this world, and am fully contented with believing that the surest way for us is to believe in Christ, to fear God, and work righteousness in obedience to the Gospel, and thus secure our own happiness without prying too curiously into the secret and future designs of God. The Apostles themselves declared, ' *We* know but in part, and *we* prophesy but in part.' If the chosen and inspired ambassadors of Jesus Christ were imperfect in their knowledge, how can we expect perfection in this life ?

"If, upon this declaration of my mind, you see fit to recommend to the Society to recall the invitation they have given me to settle with you, I am content." — pp. 144 – 146.

The committee, it appears, "did not think the matters in question were so essential as to suspend their proceedings." "Some of them" — we give Dr. Belknap's words — "said they differed from me in their apprehension of these points, but as we agreed in the main truths of Christianity, faith, repentance, and holiness, and salvation through Jesus Christ, there was no need of further debate ; and then proceeded to make preparation for my instalment."

Dr. Belknap died June 19, 1798, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, and the thirtieth of his united ministries in Dover and Boston, — the eleventh of the latter. He was seized suddenly with a paralytic affection, for which two previous slighter attacks had prepared him, and he regarded them as monitors to fulfil with earnestness the work appointed him. His bosom friend and companion, Dr. John Clarke, had departed with like suddenness at a still earlier age ;\* and some

---

\* The most intimate friendship subsisted between these excellent persons. Dr. Belknap, whose own readiness to bestow his literary aid on all who sought or needed it was remarkable, is understood to have been assisted in the compilation of his Psalms and Hymns by his friend. When separated, they maintained a correspondence ; and on one of his journeys, Dr. Belknap's carriage having twice broken down, though with no other injury than the detention and inconvenience, Dr. Clarke, who had been faithfully informed, thus writes of the accident. Those of our readers who are familiar with his published letters and sermons may discover even in this *jeu d'esprit* no indistinct traces of his carefully measured style. "Our brothers are well, and do not forget you at their social meetings. Do write often, and let all your letters assure us, that, though your carriage breaks

traditions or remembrances are preserved of an interesting dream, in which Dr. Belknap imagined that his friend appeared to him, on a visit from the heavenly world ; and that he had eagerly inquired of him as to the nature of his employments and the felicity he was enjoying. The curiosity, if thus expressed, was soon to be gratified. They who were thus pleasant in their lives were separated in their deaths by the interval of only a few short weeks, and permitted together to behold God's face in righteousness, and to enter upon a service for which their earthly ministries were but imperfect preparations.

In this brief and inadequate view we have taken of a distinguished scholar and divine, we cannot but "remember the way" through which it pleased the Great Disposer to conduct him to his eminent usefulness and honor. We have adverted to the spiritual conflicts and humility of heart with which he entered upon his ministry. We have seen that for many years of the most important period of his life he was no stranger to poverty and the depressing cares which it involves. The very works which are the monuments of his genius and the security of his fame did nothing to supply his needs. But now, after a few years have passed, New Hampshire, that witnessed his struggles while he was penning her history, claims him as one of her most honored sons. A county within her borders is called after him. The descendants of the people to whom he ministered, though too young to have known him, cherish his memory ; and the stranger in Dover cannot pass through its streets or survey its buildings without seeing inscribed upon them the name of Belknap.

F. P.

---

ART. VI. — NON-RESISTANCE.\*

THE present is emphatically an age of excitement. Inquiry is abroad in the community. Investigations, not only

---

down, your bones are whole ; though your beds are hard, your sleep is sound ; though your fare is coarse, your hunger is allayed ; and though you part with your money, you keep your spirits." — p. 234.

\* *Christian Non-Resistance, in all its important Bearings, illustrated and defended.* By ADIN BALLOU. Philadelphia. 1846. 12mo. pp. 240.



manly and bold, but daring and reckless, are going on in the midst of us. In a country like ours, where men of all opinions and of no opinions are equally tolerated, we may naturally expect the freest inquiry, the boldest investigation, and the most extravagant theories. But while we are left free to confront error with truth, and to combat extravagance with reason, we have no occasion for alarm. Still, while we have entire confidence in the power of truth, we ought not to relax our efforts in exposing error. The great power of truth lies in the very fact, that it will so commend itself to intelligent minds, that they will make every effort to inculcate and defend it. Whenever or wherever error is advanced, it must be met by argument and be put down, — not by the arm of the law, but by the power of truth. Even when the error is an old, exploded one, if it be brought forward anew, the battle must be fought over again; for many of our modern heroes will consider themselves invincible, if they are left in the quiet possession of any field. The task may be an unpleasant and a laborious one; but the advocate of truth must be willing to buckle on his armor whenever the foe appears; he must act as a minute-man, and at the same time enlist during the war; he must assail error and expose folly wherever they may appear, or whoever may be their advocates.

We have been led to these remarks by the perusal of the work before us. Mr. Ballou is one of that class of professed Christians who find little or nothing to approve either in Church or State. He is so opposed to the present organization of society, that he and a few others have in a manner withdrawn from the world, and formed themselves into a *community*, where their property to a certain extent is held in common. They have no fellowship with any sect in religion, no sympathy with any party in politics; but renounce all communion with the Church, and abjure all allegiance to human governments. They are, to a certain extent, *Come-outers*, with reference both to religion and to politics, — regarding Church and State, as at present organized, as so corrupt and corrupting, that it is the duty of all good men to come out from them. They seem entirely to overlook the important fact, that the evils in the world arise, not so much from the organization of society as from the imperfections and vices of the individuals who compose it.

The temper of the work before us is generally good,

though the author has sometimes been betrayed into that severity and uncharitableness which are too common with those who style themselves "reformers." We will give one extract as a specimen of this severity, which is hardly consistent in one who calls himself "a Christian Non-Resistant," and who virtually tells us in his preface that he is half a century in advance of the age.

"We must," says he, "listen again to the scoffs of skepticism, the growls of frowning bigotry, and the jargon of Babylon the great. We must hear those who make the sword, the gibbet, and the dungeon their gods, denounce the doctrine of mercy, and extol the efficacy of cruelty."

The book, in the main, is written with marked ability, though it contains some things not worthy of the author's acknowledged talents. His divisions and subdivisions are a little too artificial; and if the "hand of Joab" is not in the work, there is frequently paraded on his page an index or *hand*, pointing to some word or sentence, — which we think in bad taste. But these are minor faults, on which we have no disposition to dwell.

Mr. Ballou defines his doctrine as follows: —

"It is not non-resistance to animals and inanimate things, nor to Satan, but only to human beings. Nor is it *moral* non-resistance to human beings, but chiefly physical. Nor is it physical non-resistance to all human beings under all circumstances, but only so far as to abstain totally from the infliction of personal injury as a means of resistance. It is simply non-resistance of injury with injury, evil with evil." — p. 11.

Mr. Ballou holds that it is wrong in all cases to inflict any punishment of a character injurious to the individual; and that no injustice may be done to his views, we will let him define his own position, and explain his use of the term *injury*.

"I use the term in a somewhat peculiar sense, to signify any moral influence or physical force exerted by one human being upon another, the legitimate effect of which is to destroy or impair life, to destroy or impair the physical faculties, to destroy or impair the intellectual powers, to destroy, impair, or pervert the moral and religious sentiments, or to destroy or impair the absolute welfare, all things considered, of the person on whom such influence or force is exerted; whether that person be inno-

cent or guilty, harmless or offensive, injurious or uninjurious, sane or insane, *compos mentis* or *non compos mentis*, adult or infant. Some of the lexicographers define an 'injury' to be 'hurt, harm, or mischief *unjustly* done to a person,' thereby implying that any hurt, harm, or mischief done to one who deserves nothing better, or can be considered as justly liable to it, is no injury at all. I reject entirely every such qualification of the term. I hold an injury to be an injury, whether deserved or undeserved, whether intended or unintended, whether well-meant or ill-meant, determining the fact in accordance with the foregoing definition." — pp. 15, 16.

We will next present the reader with Mr. Ballou's opinion of the governments under which we live, both state and national.

"The governments now under notice are radically, fundamentally, anti-Christian. 'The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint.' Military and injurious penal power is their very life-blood, — the stamina of their existence. They are as repugnant to non-resistance as pride is to humility, wrath to meekness, vengeance to forgiveness, death to life, destruction to salvation." — p. 220.

"If I accept any office of distinction, I must swear or affirm to support the Constitution, not in parts, but entire. In fact, I cannot vote, without either actually taking such an oath or affirmation, or, at least, virtually acknowledging myself to be under the highest obligations of allegiance. Government, in this country, is vested in the voters. They are leagued together by their common declaration of sentiments and mutual covenant — the Constitution — to conduct the government in a certain way, and to maintain its authority by military force. It seems to have been universally taken for granted that military force would be indispensable. It is therefore a gross fraud and imposition for any man to appear at the ballot-box as a voter, who is at heart false to the Constitution, who does not mean in good faith to abide by and support it, and just as it is, till it can be constitutionally amended. This is what a non-resistant cannot do without treason to the Divine government; without trampling under foot the precepts of Jesus Christ. . . . I will hold office on no such conditions. I will not be a voter on such conditions. I will join no church or state who hold such a creed, or prescribe such a covenant for the subscription of their members." — pp. 221, 222.

These citations put us in possession of Mr. Ballou's sentiments. On the practical workings of such a theory we

need not enlarge. We have no disposition to call Mr. Ballou's sincerity in question ; for we have long been satisfied that men may be sincere in error, as well as in truth. Men of strong feelings and ardent temperament may brood over a single subject, till its importance is so magnified in their estimation, that they can hardly perceive any thing else. Nor does strength of intellect always guard such men from error. We often see men of strong mental powers, whose minds appear to run in a groove ; and they seem to have almost as little disposition or ability to hearken to reason, or turn from their favorite path, as a locomotive has to quit the track of a railroad. But, while we accord to such men sincerity and a becoming zeal, we cannot allow them to be sure guides to truth. Our author is undoubtedly sincere ; but we are still of the opinion, that his doctrines are subversive of all order, and fatal to the peace and well-being of society.

We are aware that he attempts to sustain his positions by the Scriptures, and appeals to the teachings and example of Christ. But, after a careful examination of his arguments, we must say that they are not satisfactory to us. We revere the teaching of Christ ; we bow submissively to the revealed will of God. But, at the same time, we know that men may err in their interpretation of Christ's discourses. We have but little confidence in that system of interpretation which relies upon the mere sound of a passage or a phrase. We have too much regard for the revelations of the Most High to adopt a system of exegesis thus narrow and arbitrary. We are far from believing that every truth of God is contained in his written revelation. There are great and fundamental truths taught by the Creator in his works, which lie behind all written revelation. Among these we may mention the existence of God, and the moral, intellectual, and social nature of man. These are divine truths, and exist independently of the Bible. They were known before the sacred books were written, and are as binding, as divine, as any thing contained in the written volume. Nay, they constitute the basis of all written revelations, and furnish a standard by which these must be interpreted. This is self-evident. For, if there were no God, there could be no revelation from him ; and if man were not an intellectual, moral, and social being, such revelations as the Bible contains would be entirely useless. The intellectual, moral, and social nature of man not only precedes the teachings of



Christ, but furnishes a sure standard by which his teachings are to be interpreted. If there were a passage in Scripture, the literal interpretation of which would conflict with the position that man is an intellectual, moral, and social being, that fact alone would require us to seek for some other exposition.

The social nature of man not only prompts him to seek society, but renders society essential to the full development of his powers. "It is not good for man to be alone." The great end of his being would be defeated, if he were to live in solitude. We learn, then, independently of the Bible, that God designed man for society. And society requires government and laws, and can no more exist without them than the material world can exist without the law of gravity. We have, then, Divine authority for the establishment of civil institutions. We have the same evidence of man's social nature that we have of his existence; and we can no more doubt that he was made for society than we can doubt that he was made at all. This social nature, established by the Creator, impressed upon us by the favoring hand of God himself, not only proves that man was made for society, but that he has duties which he owes to society. Every duty of which we can conceive grows out of some relation which subsists between man and some other being. When we speak of man's duty to God, we imply that there is some relation between him and us. God being our Creator, we stand in the relation of children to him, and hence are under all the obligations which that relation implies. Our social nature allies us to society, and all the relations that thence arise create new obligations. To illustrate this point, let us take our original ancestors. Adam was created by God, and, standing in the relation of a child, he owed certain duties to his Maker. But, having no earthly brethren, there could be no such relation, and hence no duties, towards them. But as soon as Eve was created, a new relation arose, which relation created new obligations. As his family increased, these relations would multiply, and each would bring with it a new class of duties. The right of property, which could not be contested when there was but a single inhabitant of the earth, must, of necessity, come up as population increased. Every new relation in society, every advance from the savage state, imposes some new duty, and lays man under some new obligation. The very idea of so-

ciety implies relations and duties ; and all duties imply some restraint. As each individual has personal rights, when he enters into society these rights will, and to a certain extent must, be trenched upon by other individuals, or by society ; and hence some rules and regulations must be established to define and guard private rights, and to preserve social order. These rules and regulations, or, in other words, *laws*, presuppose a law-making power ; and the administration of the laws implies a judicial department in some form or other. And as all laws imply a penalty, there must be a power residing somewhere to execute the law and exact the penalty. Thus the social nature of man implies society, society implies laws, and these presuppose a civil government in some form or other.

Government grows as necessarily out of the social nature of man, as religion out of his moral nature. The wants of the individual and the wants of the community both demand civil institutions. Man is one side of his nature selfish, and, were there no laws to restrain him, he would, in the indulgence of his selfishness, seize upon the property of others. The numerous thefts and robberies, even in well-regulated communities, show conclusively that without law the world would be overrun with violence. So well satisfied have men always been of the necessity of law, that no nation or people or tribe has ever existed without some form of government. The very nature of man and the structure of society imperatively demand restraining rules to secure the general peace and safety. If any people should attempt to live without law, they would soon be compelled to abandon that course. For unprincipled men are found in every community ; and when one of them should make war upon society and habitually invade the rights of others, — assailing female virtue, seizing upon whatever property he might desire, and killing all that might oppose his criminal designs, — that community would rise at once and execute summary justice upon the offender, or would at least adopt some regulations for the prevention of such enormities in future. Laws are necessary to protect not only the virtuous, but the vicious also. Let an act of homicide be committed in a community where there was no law, and where public indignation had no restraint, and the plea of insanity, which is justly and successfully set up in many cases in a land of law and order, would in most cases be disregarded, and

*Lynch* law would soon put the offender out of existence. Acting from excitement, great injustice would generally be done, and cruel and unnatural punishments would be inflicted, and sometimes would fall upon the innocent.

Civil government is just what common sense would dictate, and what the experience of mankind has always found to be necessary. Government is essential to all well-regulated communities, and would grow up from necessity among any people. Let us suppose that a man and his wife were shipwrecked upon an uninhabited island in the midst of the ocean, and were entirely ignorant of the existence of human government. Being the sole possessors of the island, and having no intercourse with the rest of the world, they would not at first see the necessity of any government. In a short time, another pair, as ignorant of all government as themselves, are cast upon the same island. Then the question of property would arise, and some arrangement would take place upon that subject. If at first they should adopt a community of goods, and agree to hunt and fish together, as their number increased, and their children arrived at manhood, they would, in all probability, separate into families, that each might manage its own affairs in its own way, and enjoy the fruits of its own industry. Living in separate families, there would naturally be a division of the soil or hunting-ground, which must be the subject of conventional arrangement. With the ordinary disposition of citizens, as their interests might come in competition, disputes would arise; and these must either be decided by brute force, or be referred to some arbiter, if one could be agreed upon. But the parties, being excited, would find it difficult, in some cases, to agree upon an arbiter. This would naturally lead to the selection of a general arbiter or judge, for all cases where the parties could not agree. It would also be found necessary to adopt some rules and regulations by which the arbiter should be governed; otherwise he might be partial, and do injustice to one of the parties. And as cases should arise for which they had no established rule, they would be led to make provision for the prevention or settlement of such cases in future. Rules would be multiplied, and regulations adopted, as new cases arose, or the wants of the people demanded. Thus we should find civil government growing up among the inhabitants of this island from necessity. If the people were sufficiently intelligent to understand their own interests, this would take

place as a matter of course. But a rude and ignorant people would be quite as likely to resort to brute force in cases of controversy ; this would lead to war, when some master spirit, who had distinguished himself in the contest, would place himself at the head of the victorious party, and become the lawgiver of the people. But as no one man could attend to all the affairs of state in person, he would be compelled to organize some form of government, for the purpose of conducting the affairs of his kingdom. In either case, a human government would exist from the necessity of the case. Such has been the experience of every people, and such, we venture to predict, will be the fact in all coming ages.

Now, if the Bible were silent upon this subject, if it taught nothing, even by implication, in relation to the necessity of civil government, no rational man could entertain a doubt respecting it. The very nature which God has given us not only suggests, but requires, civil institutions ; and the duty of establishing and maintaining them is just as important and as binding as though it were enjoined on every page of Scripture. But we maintain that the revealed will of God, as contained in the Scriptures, not only allows, but justifies and demands, the establishment and maintenance of civil institutions. If we look at the Old Testament, we shall see the Deity leaving his throne in the heavens, and coming down to establish a civil government among his chosen people, — a government containing a criminal code and a civil code, extending to all classes of crimes, and to the most minute police regulations. This government and these laws were established to guard the rights, preserve the peace, and promote the happiness of the people. The obligations there recognized, and the duties there enjoined, grew, in a great measure, out of the relations which society created, — out of the social state of man. And if we look at the New Testament, we shall see that this last, best gift of God to man does not annul civil institutions. Christ, it is true, abrogated “ the legal dispensation,” as such ; but he did not discard the moral elements which lay at the foundation of the Mosaic Law. He dissolved the Levitical priesthood, but he retained and perfected all that was moral and spiritual in the worship of Jehovah. He abrogated the Jewish theocracy ; but he handed over to the nations of the earth the whole department of civil institutions. He came not to destroy the Law, in any moral sense, but to enforce its obligations by higher and more holy



sanctions. He could not, therefore, revoke any of those obligations which grow out of the relations we sustain to God, to one another, and to society. The civil department of the Jewish dispensation was founded on the principle, that, living in a social state, man sustains relations and owes duties to his brother-man; and as long as man lives in society, these relations and duties must exist. The Jewish law recognized the principle, that each individual has certain rights and privileges, which no other can rightfully invade; and as long as these rights and privileges appertain to man, civil government will be necessary for his protection. In fact, as long as men live in society, as long as they have passions which they do not restrain, as long as they are imperfect beings, government and laws will be found necessary. The same causes which required civil government in the days of Moses require it under the Gospel. It may not be necessary to affix the same penalty to a law now, as was found expedient in ruder states of society; but government and laws are essential in every age of the world. Hence the Gospel as well as the Law, Christ no less than Moses, requires the establishment and maintenance of civil institutions. The Apostle expressly declares, that "the powers that be are ordained of God," and that the civil ruler is "the minister of God for good, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

If we are right in the view we have taken, it follows, with all the force of moral demonstration, that civil institutions are not only allowed, but absolutely required, by the Supreme Lawgiver of the universe. This doctrine, as we have seen, grows necessarily out of that social and moral nature which God has given us, and is fully sustained by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The very law of love, which non-resistants appear to think supersedes human governments, absolutely requires their establishment. In the Divine law, man's love to himself is recognized, and is made the measure of his love to others:—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Now, if a man loves himself, in the Christian sense of that term, he will set up such institutions as will protect him in his life, liberty, and property,—as will give him the greatest amount of civil, social, and moral enjoyment, consistent with the rights and interests of others. He will institute such a government, and enact such laws, as will enable him best to develop his powers, and bring him into the closest communion with his Maker. And if he loves

his neighbour as himself, he will set up these same institutions for his neighbour's good. He cannot be said to "love the Lord his God with all his heart," unless he uses all the means which God has put in his power to improve himself and society, and so augment the sum of human happiness. Thus the two great commands, — the summary of the Old Testament and the essence of the New, — instead of being hostile to civil governments, lay us under the most solemn obligation to establish and maintain them.

We have dwelt longer upon this part of our subject than would otherwise be necessary, because we believe that our position, that God requires human governments, is fatal to the theory of non-resistance. We have endeavoured to show that civil government is designed by God, and grows necessarily out of the wants of associated man. If this be true, human government, in some form, is designed as a perpetual institution, and hence must be invested with all the powers necessary for self-preservation. It must, to answer the end for which it was designed, possess the power of defending itself and protecting its citizens, of preventing the greatest amount of evil, and of producing the greatest amount of good. It must be clothed with authority to make all laws which the condition of the people may require, and to enforce them with such penalties as may seem best calculated to secure the great end for which it was instituted. In a word, government must be invested with sovereign power. It has, and from the nature of the case must have, the right of self-defence, even if it be by the sword. To deny to government the power of self-defence is practically to defeat the whole object for which it was instituted. Government could neither fulfil the appointment of Heaven, nor promote the welfare of the people, if it were shorn of this vital, self-sustaining prerogative. As the wants of the people demand a government, so they demand the exercise of every power necessary for its preservation. Civil institutions being a blessing to society, every thing indispensable to their preservation must, all things considered, be viewed in the same light. Even war, great as that calamity is, when undertaken in strict self-defence, is justifiable. It is a means, painful and terrific, of averting a greater evil, — anarchy, or unconditional servitude. On the same principle, every sovereignty has power over the property, the liberty, and lives of its citizens. The property of an individual must yield to the paramount interest

of the community, they rendering him a just compensation. When an individual becomes dangerous to the community, that community have a right to abridge his liberty ; and when an individual levies war against the government or its citizens, that government has the right, in virtue of its sovereignty, to take the life of the individual. These powers should not be exercised for slight or trivial causes ; but when an exigency arises, and the question is presented, whether the government shall be overthrown, and the whole people exposed to all the evils of anarchy and bloodshed, or the author of all this intended misery shall be put to death, there can be no doubt of the rightful power of the government to take the life of the offender. It grows out of the right of self-defence, or, in other words, of self-preservation. We admit that taking life is, in the abstract, an evil ; but viewed in connection with the good of society, it is what enlightened benevolence requires. Mr. Ballou himself allows that amputating a limb, though an evil in the abstract, is justifiable, on the ground that the limb has become a nuisance, and its removal may save the life of the individual. So society has the right to cut off one of its members that has become incurably diseased, in order to preserve the health and save the life of the body politic. To controvert this principle is to arraign the administration of the Almighty ; for in the government of the world we see this doctrine daily exhibited.

The Divine authority of human government teaches another important lesson, which is repugnant to Mr. Ballou's theory. We have already seen that society creates certain relations, and these relations impose certain duties ; and these are, of course, binding upon each member of the community. Men living in society can no more escape from the responsibilities of citizens, than they can escape from the responsibility they are under to God. The vague notion entertained by non-resistant Come-outers, that they can live in society, and partake of all the blessings of good government, without incurring any obligation to sustain the government, is preposterous. It is founded on gross selfishness, and is at war with some of the first principles of Gospel morality. It is true, they pretend that they ask no favors of the government, and seek no protection from the magistrate. But all such persons must know that the government throws its protecting ægis over every person, without any application on his part. These men hold property under the laws of the land, and en-

joy personal protection as much as others. They labor, knowing that the law will secure to them the fruit of their toil; they sleep quietly at night, from a knowledge that the watchmen guard the city, and that the arm of the magistrate wields a sword which tends to awe the assassin and hold the midnight incendiary in check. They know that the great value of law lies in its power to prevent crime, and to secure order and peace in the community. They know that this mild influence of law is felt everywhere, and, like the gentle dew of heaven, descends upon all. They cannot be ignorant of the fact, that they, in common with the friends of human government, enjoy all the blessings of law and order, all the blissful fruits of well-regulated institutions. But they tell us that they renounce all allegiance to human government. Renounce all allegiance to human government! Live under the protection of law, and partake of all the blessings flowing therefrom, and still owe no obligation to the hand that protects them! Is this the high and holy code of which they boast, — this the pure and elevated morality, the new system of ethics, by which the world is to be regenerated? They might, on the same principle, abjure the government of Him in whom they “live and move and have their being.” They might as well say to the Author of all good, whose perpetual pensioners they are, whose arm upholds and whose hand feeds them, — We ask no favors, we owe no allegiance. But we will not pursue this absurdity. Such men enjoy the protection of law, and partake of the innumerable blessings which flow from civil institutions, and then, like the serpent in the fable, would sting the bosom which warms them into life.

But we should do injustice to Mr. Ballou, did we not state that he professes to derive his doctrine of non-resistance from the Scriptures. We will let him speak for himself.

“Whence originated the term *Christian non-resistance*? Non-resistance comes from the injunction, ‘*Resist not evil.*’ Matt. v. 39. The words ‘*resist not,*’ being changed from the form of a verb to that of a substantive, give us *non-resistance*. . . . . Now let us examine Matt. v. 39. ‘I say unto you, resist not evil,’ etc. This single text, from which, as has been stated, the term non-resistance took its rise, if justly construed, furnishes a complete key to the true bearings, limitations, and applications of the doctrine under discussion. This is precisely one of those precepts which may be easily made to mean much more, or much



less, than its author intended. It is in the *intensive*, condensed form of expression, and can be understood only by a due regard to its context." — pp. 20 – 22.

Here is the statement of the question by the author of the volume before us, and here the key-text on which he relies. We agree fully with him in saying that the passage, "Resist not evil," is "precisely one of those precepts which may be easily made to mean much more, or much less, than its author intended," and that "it is in the intensive, condensed form of expression," and should be interpreted with great care and caution. A fundamental rule of interpretation is, to construe all passages in accordance with well-known and established facts, and with the great principles on which all written revelation must rest. We have already seen that the social nature of man implies society, government, and laws ; and that this government must have the power of self-preservation. These, we have seen, are fundamental principles, which precede all written revelation, and in accordance with which all Scripture must be construed. Mr. Ballou himself, after dwelling for some time on the subject of government, says, — "I come, then, to the following conclusion ; that government of some sort supplies a fundamental want of human nature, and must exist wherever men exist. In this respect it is ordained of God."\* Now, if government supplies a fundamental want of human nature, and must exist wherever men exist, and this government is ordained of God, then our author must agree with us, that this is a fundamental truth, with which no Scripture rightly interpreted can conflict. And if government must exist wherever men exist, it must possess, from necessity, the right of self-defence, that is, of self-preservation. We are compelled, then, to construe every passage of Scripture, and consequently the passage, "Resist not evil," in such a manner as to leave those necessary, those Divinely ordained governments in possession of the power of physical self-defence. This disposes of his famous key-text at once, and so saps the foundation of his whole theory. We might safely leave the matter here, and our non-resistant friends would be under the necessity of arraigning particular texts against the fundamental principles of revelation, or of giving up their theory ; but we are disposed to examine this subject a little more closely.

---

\* Page 94.

What, then, is the true exposition of the passage, "Resist not evil"? This passage is found in Christ's Sermon on the Mount, which contains many figurative, intensive expressions, that cannot be understood literally, but must be so interpreted as to harmonize with all well-known facts and with the general tenor of the Scriptures. "Resist not evil": — the precept cannot be interpreted literally, because that would make the Saviour declare, contrary to his general teaching, that we must not oppose evil by any means whatever. We are, then, necessarily driven to some qualification of the passage. It contains a prohibition against resisting evil in some manner, and the question is, What is that mode of opposition to evil which is here prohibited? In the first place, it cannot relate to the mode of punishment which civil governments adopt; for Christ was not speaking of governments, but of individuals, — of those who had wives, swore profanely, wore coats and cloaks, etc., which could not be said of governments. So that whatever interpretation we put upon the passage, it can have no reference to civil penalties. The context also shows that our divine Master was treating of motives rather than of outward actions. He knew that the Jewish people had made the Law "of none effect by their traditions"; and that by their glosses they had perverted the spirit of the Law, and were disposed to rest on the letter, which they had also abused and perverted. He alludes to those corrupters of the Law by the phrase, "them of old time." It is manifest that he refers to their comments, rather than to the text of Moses; for one of the sayings ascribed to them, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and *hate thine enemy*," is not contained in the Law of Moses. Our Saviour alludes to various subjects on which the expounders of Moses had missed the sense or perverted the sentiment of that Law, which Jesus came "not to destroy, but to fulfil." They had placed the criminality of murder in the outward act, but Jesus called their attention to that anger and malice whence murder proceeds.\* He alludes also to adultery, and fixes the criminality in the heart; to voluntary oaths, which he repudiates. In each of these cases, the divine Teacher calls back the attention of the people to the motive, and endeavours to improve their conduct and their creed by addressing himself to the heart, and requiring honesty

---

\* See Matt. v. 21, 22, *et seq.*

of purpose. He then comes to the passage in question, which he treats in the same way. The people, in their then polluted state, were disposed to justify every act of personal revenge and cruelty by a reference to, and an abuse of, the penal code of their great lawgiver. This abuse he endeavours to correct. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Now the evident meaning of this passage is, Do not retaliate injuries, do not vindictively and maliciously inflict evil upon the evil-doer. This, we are persuaded, is the import of the passage. He virtually tells his followers not to take the law into their own hands, and with a vindictive spirit injure the offender on account of the injury, but rather to be kind and forbearing, and leave God and his magistrates to punish the guilty. This interpretation of the passage takes it entirely out of the hands of our non-resistant friends, and is so offensive to Mr. Ballou that he breaks out in the following unguarded language: — "In this way Jesus is smoothly construed to have really said nothing at all, — practically nothing that Moses and the ancients had not said. . . . It is to make him the mere *echo* of Moses and his expounders." \* We have often noticed a propensity in those who style themselves "reformers" to abuse Moses and his dispensation; and we regret that Mr. Ballou should so far permit himself to be drawn into such a state of mind, as to think it a reproach upon the divine Teacher to call the Jewish people from the abuses of the legal dispensation back to the spirit of that Law which was given by God himself. How does our Lord conclude the very argument in this chapter, on which Mr. Ballou relies to prove his favorite theory? He sums up the whole by saying, — "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." This summing up of the whole discourse is almost an exact quotation from Leviticus xi. 44, and xix. 2; and why does not Mr. Ballou contemptuously declare that this makes the Saviour say nothing at all, and renders him the mere echo of Moses? Did Christ say nothing at all worthy of the consideration of sincere Christians, when he gave us what is generally denominated his "golden rule," and when he delivered the "two great

---

\* Pages 38, 39.

commandments," because he adds at the close of them, — "This is the *Law* and the prophets" ?

The whole force of Mr. Ballou's argument from this passage turns on the position, that Christ must teach something in the precept, "Resist not evil," in opposition to the saying to which he referred in the preceding verse. Now we admit the soundness of this position ; but we contend that the antithesis is complete on our construction. The Scribes and Pharisees had abused or perverted the Law of Moses, so as to justify personal revenge and cruelty, which Jesus reprobates in the words, "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil." The labor which Mr. Ballou bestows upon the passage before us shows that he regards it as vital to his theory. And while we admit that his statement of the case is specious, and his arguments ingenious, we believe that a like specious ingenuity would, with equal clearness and force, make other passages in the same discourse of our Lord teach doctrines abhorrent to the first principles of Christianity. "Take no thought for the morrow." This command is as plain as the command, "Resist not evil" ; and we might appeal to the context, or to the example of Christ and his Apostles, and, with less display of divisions and subdivisions, we could prove, in the same way in which Mr. Ballou sustains his exposition of Matthew v. 39, that Christ absolutely prohibits Christians from making any provision in any case for the morrow, or even taking any thought for it, so far at least as food and raiment are concerned.

But we have already devoted too much time to this part of our subject. We now propose to show that the parallel passages to which Mr. Ballou himself refers, and which he presses into his service, fully justify our exposition. Our limits will not permit us to remark upon every passage of this class, but we will take the twelfth chapter of Romans, as one of the most striking. The Apostle, in that chapter, discusses the subject of resisting injuries, and adopts almost precisely the same language which Mr. Ballou uses in explaining what he calls his key-text. He presents the subject in various ways, with a marked variety of phraseology, and furnishes us with the reason why we must not avenge our own wrongs. In verse tenth, he says, — "Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love" ; in verse fourteenth, — "Bless them which persecute you ; bless, and curse not" ; and in verse seventeenth, — "Recompense to no man evil for



evil." Here we have the subject of resistance, or non-resistance, presented in three different forms of expression ; but the Apostle, in the very next verse, gives us a distinct intimation that resistance in all cases could not be dispensed with : — "*If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.*" Having spoken on the subject of resistance, and given a plain indication that it could not in all cases be avoided, with this limitation in view he says, in verse nineteenth, — "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath [or punishment] ; for it is written, Vengeance is mine ; I will repay, saith the Lord." Here we are commanded, with the limitation contained in the preceding verse, not to avenge our own wrongs, but rather give place to the due execution of the law ; and the reason is assigned why we should refrain from taking justice into our own hands : — "I will repay, saith the Lord," — I will punish the transgressor. From the doctrine thus laid down, the Apostle draws the following inference, in verses twentieth and twenty-first : — "Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink ; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." The doctrine of the Apostle in this chapter is too plain to be mistaken. He enjoins the exercise of benevolence and love, commands us not to render evil for evil, and, as far as it can possibly be done with safety, not to avenge our own wrongs ; because God in his providential government will punish the transgressor. An important inquiry here arises, — How, or by what instrumentality, will God punish the transgressor ? The Apostle has fully answered this question. He closes the twelfth chapter in the language we have already quoted, and in the very next words he informs us that God has instituted human governments to do this very thing. He considers the subject of human governments, and points out their power of punishing transgressors, through the first seven verses of this thirteenth chapter, and then, in verse eighth, resumes the subject on which he was speaking in the twelfth chapter, and repeats the same sentiment in nearly the same language : — "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another ; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." The argument of the Apostle is clearly this : — The Gospel requires benevolence and love ; hence you are never to render evil for evil, or *retaliate* injuries. As far as possible, you are to refrain

from avenging your own personal wrongs ; for God, through the instrumentality of human governments, which he himself has ordained, will punish the violations of law more equitably than you could do ; therefore exercise love and forbearance one to another, for this is fulfilling the law.

If this view of the subject can be sustained, it furnishes a full and perfect refutation of the theory of non-resistance. What, then, is the doctrine of the Apostle in the first seven verses of the thirteenth chapter of Romans ? In the first two verses he says, — “ Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God : the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God ; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” Here we have the great doctrines laid down, that governments are ordained of God, and that men are bound to obey them. We shall not stop here to notice Mr. Ballou’s metaphysical distinctions between a government *per se*, a government *de jure*, and a government *de facto* ; it is sufficient for our purpose to take his confession, that “ government of some sort supplies a fundamental want of human nature, and must exist wherever men exist,” and that “ governments *de facto* are the nearest approaches which the mass of men, in their present low moral condition, are capable of making to the true ideal,” and that, “ in this respect, government is ordained of God.” \* Neither is it necessary to inquire in what sense government is ordained of God ; it is sufficient for our present purpose to know that God has instituted government in a sense so direct as to lay men under obligation to obey its laws. Hence, “ they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” The Apostle continues his argument in verses third to sixth, inclusive, as follows : — “ For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power ? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same ; for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid ; for he beareth not the sword in vain : for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience’ sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also ; for they are God’s ministers, at-

tending continually upon this very thing." Here we have several important doctrines distinctly laid down. First, that God ordains human governments. The Apostle says:—"The powers that be are ordained of God"; that governments are "the ordinance of God"; and that the magistrate is "the minister of God." Secondly, that these governments have full power to punish transgressors, and to defend themselves. This position grows necessarily out of the first; for if God has instituted government as a perpetual institution, he must have clothed it with the power of self-defence, that is, of self-preservation. We are also told by the Apostle, that the magistrate is "the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil"; that his retributions are such as to excite fear, and prove a terror to evil-doers; and that "he beareth not the sword in vain." Thirdly, that every citizen is bound to obey the government and sustain its authority. This position is the only legitimate inference to be drawn from the two preceding. St. Paul places the duty of submission or obedience directly upon the fact that God has ordained governments, and ordained them for good,—for the restraint of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. But some persons would have us believe, that we owe nothing to governments but mere non-resistant submission; that we must submit, not approvingly, but simply because we are forbidden to resist evil,—thus making the duty a mere negative duty. It is obvious that the Apostle goes much farther than this. He makes it a positive, active duty, founded on the fact that God has instituted government for good; and he requires us, on Christian principles, to sustain it, as we would any other good, any other Divine institution; not simply from a fear of punishment, but "for conscience' sake."

The same truths are taught in other passages of Scripture. Paul commands Titus (iii. 1) to put the believers in mind "to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." Being subject to authority and obeying magistrates are not only enjoined, but, by being classed with other "good works," are made active Christian duties. Peter says (1 Pet. ii. 13–15):—"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well."

For so is the will of God, that with *well-doing* ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." Submission to authority is here enjoined, though government is called the "ordinance of man," and this obedience is to be rendered "for the Lord's sake." Peter evidently meant to make this submission something more than mere non-resistance; for he adds, in immediate connection, — "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king." In this passage honoring the king, or government, is made a positive virtue, as much as loving the brotherhood or fearing God. Peter also speaks (2 Pet. ii. 9, 10) of "the unjust" whom God has reserved "unto the day of judgment to be punished," and then adds, — "But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and *despise government*. Presumptuous are they, self-willed; they *are not afraid to speak evil of dignities*." Jude makes use of nearly the same language, when speaking of the same class of sinners. These passages of Scripture teach us that submission to government is a positive virtue, founded on Christian principles; and hence the performance of this duty is commended, and the violation of it is classed with other sins which God will bring into judgment.

These passages fully sustain the interpretation we have given to Paul's language to the Romans. The duty of paying tribute Paul enforces by the fact, that the magistrate, devoting himself continually to public affairs, should, on the principles of Christian justice, be supported by those for whose benefit the government is instituted and the laws administered. He then sums up our duty to government, in the seventh verse of the thirteenth chapter, as follows: — "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

Having declared that governments are ordained of God, and that he employs the civil magistrate to punish transgressors, and has clothed him with full power for that purpose, — that we owe to government, not mere non-resistant submission, but active, cheerful obedience, — the Apostle resumes the subject of which he was treating in the preceding chapter, and commands us to love one another, thereby teaching us that all he had said in relation to government is to be taken in connection with what he had said in the preceding chapter respecting avenging our own wrongs. The Apos-



tle's argument is too clear to be mistaken. In the twelfth chapter he commands us not to retaliate injuries, and as far as possible not to avenge the wrongs which we have received, or with which we may be threatened, because God will punish the aggressor. He then informs us that God carries on this retribution through the instrumentality of human governments, which he ordains and clothes with full power for that purpose. We can hardly conceive of a statement more clear, or an argument more conclusive ; and if Paul had written this portion of his Epistle for the express purpose of refuting the doctrine of non-resistance, we cannot see how he could have been more explicit. The passage we have been considering fully confirms the exposition we have given of Matt. v. 39 ; so that Mr. Ballou will find that his key-text unlocks a theory directly opposite to his own.

Having examined somewhat in detail the two principal passages on which non-resistants rely, we shall dismiss the Scripture argument, so far as particular texts are concerned. We shall notice, however, the use that is made of a class of passages which have, in our opinion, no bearing upon the subject. Mr. Ballou has brought together a great number of texts, in which kindness, and love, and charity, and forbearance, and mercy, and long-suffering are enjoined. Now we say concerning all such passages, that, while they teach important Christian duties, they have nothing to do with the controversy before us. Mr. Ballou cannot make them favor his peculiar views, unless he is able to show that punishment is irreconcilable with love and kindness. Is he prepared to take that ground ? Will he admit that God is hateful, unkind, and unmerciful, because he punishes his creatures, rendering " indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil " ? He must take this extreme ground, or confess that these passages are not to his purpose. But perhaps he may say that the Divine punishments do not injure the individual punished, and so do not come within his definition of evil and injury. We reply, that the Divine punishments do come strictly within his definition of injury and wrong ; they do " destroy or impair life " ; they do " destroy or impair the physical faculties." God, under his own special government of the Jews, did take life for a great variety of crimes ; and, in his providence, he is daily doing the same in the midst of us. Who does not know that God has affixed to intemperance and sensuality, and many other vices,

a penalty that destroys or impairs the physical faculties, and life itself? Now our author may embrace either horn of the dilemma; he may say that such punishments are or are not consistent with goodness. If he says that they are, then he yields a principle which saps the foundation of his non-resistant scheme; but if he says they are not, then he accuses the Almighty of injustice and cruelty. Mr. Ballou speaks of the example of Christ and the efficacy of kindness, of the mercy of God, and the benevolent system of the Gospel, as though these themes were all his own. Now we deny to non-resistants altogether the monopoly of these themes. To their representations of the mercy and compassion of God we most heartily respond. In their admiration of the pure precepts and the matchless character of Christ they have our entire sympathy. The fact is, the God of the universe is our God, as well as theirs; and his Son is the common teacher of mankind; and we maintain that the revelations of God and the teachings of his Son not only are consistent with our views, but are the foundation on which they rest, and we have the same right to employ all these subjects in support of our views that the non-resistants have in support of theirs.

But the efficacy of kindness our friend seems disposed to monopolize entirely. He speaks of it as though none but non-resistants ever dreamed that love and kindness were powerful agents in softening the human heart and reforming sinners. A person who should receive his impressions entirely from Mr. Ballou's work would suppose that all those who did not embrace his theory actually maintained, that love furnished no motive to obedience, that punishment, nay, cruelty, was the only means by which society could be governed or the human heart reached. The question is, not whether moral suasion is a powerful agent in restraining transgressors, but whether it is the only means which is to be employed. We admit the force of kind treatment, and contend that humanity, and justice even, require that mild means should always be employed in the first instance, and that severe means should not be resorted to until the milder means fail. All, therefore, which our friend says about treating the transgressor with kindness is common ground. We agree with him heartily in all his recommendations to enlighten the ignorant and elevate the low and degraded. But all this is common ground, and has nothing to do with the point at issue. He recommends moral means; so do we. He

maintains that kind treatment has great efficacy in subduing the evil passions of men ; so do we. He thinks, that, as Christians, we should seek the reformation of our offending brethren ; we concur with him in this, and employ all the means which he recommends. But if these do not effect the object, we go further, and employ other means, which he does not. The real difference between us is simply this : we go with him, or, more properly, he goes with us, to a certain point, till all mild means of restraint and reformation are exhausted. If these succeed, the work is accomplished, and there is no occasion for more severe means. The end is attained, and is attained not on non-resistant, but on common, ground. But if these mild moral means do not prove efficacious, — if the hardened offender disregard human kindness, and even trample the goodness of God in the dust, and commence a war of extermination upon society, — we would employ other and more stringent means, and so protect the innocent from his ravages. The non-resistants, on the other hand, would let him go on unmolested, destroying female innocence, robbing the poor of their hard-earned pittance, disturbing the peace of society, and crimsoning the earth with human blood. We will not appeal to the vile passions, but to the tenderest sympathies of our nature, to decide which of these causes is the more benevolent, and better calculated to promote human happiness.

From the view we have taken of this subject, it seems, to us at least, that our system has all the advantages of the system of our friend, and others in addition. We use mild means as well as he, and can go the whole length of his requirements, — can persevere till the mild means are exhausted. If, therefore, there is a sovereign efficacy in these means, we have the advantage of them in common with him. But here comes the dividing point. Here the non-resistant gives up in despair ; but we have a further work to perform. Other means are in our hands, which we are required by God to employ to guard the interests of society and reform the offender. These are advantages peculiar to our scheme. Nor can these advantages be obviated by contending, as is sometimes done, that we weaken the efficacy of the mild means by holding the severer in reserve. There is no necessary opposition between these different means. God has made man susceptible of both hope and fear, and in the Gospel both these passions are appealed to. The Gospel system of prom-

ises and threatenings, of rewards and punishments, is founded on the principle, that mild means and severe means may both be employed, and that they are adapted to the nature of man, and act in perfect harmony. Non-resistants, therefore, cannot condemn our system in this particular, without assailing at the same time the "glorious Gospel of the blessed God."

Our author devotes some twenty pages of his book to the inquiry, whether non-resistance is consistent with the laws of nature ; in the course of which inquiry he introduces those nice, hair-breadth distinctions of which he appears rather fond, and by which he is enabled to hide the true, practical question at issue. The substance of what he says, as far as we are able to comprehend it, is, that man's nature is capable of such moral improvement as will do away all aggression, and hence all resistance. While we are not disposed to controvert this position, we confess our inability to perceive its bearing upon the point in controversy. The reasoning appears to be this : because man, when his nature shall have been fully developed, will cease from aggression, and so render resistance impracticable, therefore resistance now, before this development has taken place, and while aggressions are daily committed, is unnatural. We can see nothing conclusive, or even plausible, in reasoning like this.

But our author introduces another kind of evidence in support of his theory, which, judging from the space it occupies, he must regard as conclusive in this case. "I now propose," says he, "to offer a series of facts from real life, illustrative of the truths for which I am contending, and in confirmation of my arguments." \* He then fills some sixty-five pages — more than one fourth part of his book — with a great variety of anecdotes and scraps collected from newspapers, periodicals, and children's books, gleaned from tradition, or received on mere hearsay, going to show the effect of kindness ; and with this sort of evidence he appears to be perfectly transported ; for, at the close of the exhibition of it, he exclaims, — "Who can contemplate such practical exemplifications of Christian non-resistance, and not be ravished with the excellence and loveliness of this sublime subject ?" † We confess that we read this portion of the book with a degree of mortification and regret. The work professes to be a grave treatise on an important subject, and is "addressed to the reason,

---

\* Page 127.

† Page 210.



conscience, and higher sentiments of mankind," not only now, but "half a century hence"; it is undoubtedly the result of much thought and reflection, and contains many good specimens of logical acumen and manly reasoning; and how the author of such a work should be induced to introduce as evidence such stories as the "Two Neighbours and the Manure," "Two Neighbours and the Hens," and other anecdotes of the like character, is more than we can comprehend. We do not believe that a jury could be impanelled in the Commonwealth, that would render a verdict to the amount of one dime on such evidence as these anecdotes afford. In the first place, they are not authenticated; and we have no doubt that, if they were subjected to a judicial investigation, some of them would be found to be mere fabrications, and most of them to be greatly exaggerated. In the next place, were they all true to the letter, they would not exhibit the invariable rule. We presume an equal number of cases could be found, in which corporal chastisement and penal inflictions have humbled and subdued offenders. And in the last place, take them just as they are presented, and they fail utterly to prove the doctrine of non-resistance. As we have already said, we go for the full employment of moral means. We allow the power of kindness, and would have recourse to penal restraint only in cases where moral means have been found ineffectual. So that all this display of "cases from real life," with which our author appears to have been "ravished," yields no support to his favorite system.

The advocates of non-resistance are very fond of attacking the doctrine of capital punishment. But why select the penalty of death any more than that of imprisonment? Mr. Ballou's theory is subversive of our penitentiary system; for no one will pretend that pirates and highwaymen would consent to be imprisoned for life or for a term of years. On his theory, the lowest penalty of the law, a fine, would be a mere nullity. Who believes that they who are determined to pursue an unlawful business for the sake of gain would pay a fine, when, by arming themselves, they could set the civil authority for ever at defiance? The doctrine of entire non-resistance involves the abolition of all penal restraint, and, if carried out, would overthrow all civil government.

We cannot subscribe to the estimate which non-resistants put upon individual rights. They seem to think that the claim of one individual is paramount to that of the public, and that

no man can, by his crimes, forfeit any of his rights. With such sentiments we have no sympathy. We would, as far as possible, preserve the rights of each individual; but we must allow that the aggregate claim of the community is greater than that of one person; and we believe that an individual may, by his own acts of lawless violence, forfeit his own rights. When the hardened offender wages war upon society, and takes the lives of the innocent and defenceless, not only justice, but enlightened humanity, requires that he should be put out of society. The claims of the innocent many are paramount to the claim of the guilty individual. The command, "Thou shalt not kill," is virtually a command to preserve life; and we believe that penal inflictions, even where the penalty is death, do in fact prevent killing, and so preserve life. Penal statutes deter from crime; and in this way not only guard the innocent, but prevent many from becoming guilty; and thus they operate as a blessing to the whole community. If the heartless robber enters my dwelling at midnight, armed with the implements of death, and commences the murder of my wife and children, I have the right to take his life, to save my own and that of my family; and the knowledge that every man possesses this right guards thousands during the defenceless hours of sleep, and prevents hundreds from becoming burglars.

We are no advocate for a sanguinary criminal code; on the contrary, we would have the penalties of the law as mild as the state of society will allow. We would show as much mercy to the violators of the law as is consistent with the peace and safety of the public; but we would not expend all our sympathy and compassion upon the wicked betrayer, so as to have none left for the innocent betrayed. The tendency of the age is to clemency; and when the Gospel shall have performed its perfect work, it will supersede resistance by doing away aggression. While we deprecate the necessity of penal inflictions, we would use all the means in our power to inculcate justice, good-will, and charity among men, as the surest mode of preventing violence. And we would submit to our non-resistant friends, whether they could not do something in this particular, by restraining a little of that vituperation which appears too frequently in their writings. Judging from their public addresses, we must confess that we know of no body of men who are more unsparing in their censures, more sweeping in their denunciation of entire classes,

more bitter and pugnacious in words, at least, than these non-resistant Come-outers. So far as denunciation corrupts public sentiment and engenders ill-will, we are inclined to believe that they contribute their full share to keep up the spirit of violence in the community. We would commend this point to their special consideration, and would say to them and to others, in the language of the Apostle, "Let all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and evil-speaking be put away from among you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, in Christ, hath forgiven you." C. H.

---

ART. VII.—MARTINEAU'S DISCOURSES.\*

WE read Mr. Martineau's "Rationale of Religious Inquiry" soon after it came out, about ten years ago, but were not much interested in it. Afterwards, hearing it spoken of as one of the most remarkable works of the age, we supposed that we must have done it great injustice, and therefore took it up again, but with the same result as before. It did not fulfil the expectations to which the title naturally gave rise. It is not sufficiently comprehensive and complete for a philosophical treatise, and is altogether too loose in its style, arrangement, and definitions. It seemed to us the hasty work of a very able man, and, while the actual performance left us disappointed, it left us also with high expectations of what the author might still do. The public evidently do not agree with us, for a third edition has been called for in England; and there is perhaps no living Unitarian preacher, except Dr. Dewey, whose works are uniformly received with so much favor as Mr. Martineau's.

The present volume is to us far more interesting and satisfactory than either the "Rationale" or the first of the series to which this belongs. The author has here taken what seems to us his true position. Standing on a high eminence of moral and religious truth, he, with earnest thought and vigorous pen, would make known to others what he himself sees. He seldom attempts any thing like an elaborate

---

\* *Endeavour after the Christian Life. Discourses by JAMES MARTINEAU.* Vol. II. London: J. Chapman. 1847. 12mo. pp. 350.

process of reasoning. He paints men to themselves as they are in the light of his truth. He holds up the prevailing objects of human ambition, and the motives to piety and virtue as they appear to him, to make such appeal as they may to the human heart. He is not a formal apologist for religion, but, having proved its reality by his own experience, and felt the entrancing sweetness of its hopes and affections, he would call others to taste these sublime enjoyments, and know how good they are. The best sermons he would regard, not as a passionate appeal even to the religious sensibilities of a congregation, but as a sort of soliloquy, in which the soul manifests its purest and best experience. "Preaching," he tells us in his preface, "is essentially a lyric expression of the soul, an utterance of meditation in sorrow, hope, love, and joy, from a representative of the human heart in its divine relations." Again, he says, — "The thoughts and aspirations which look direct to God, and the kindling of which among a fraternity of men constitutes social worship, are natives of solitude, . . . . and would not [before a congregation] spontaneously rise, till the presence of a multitude was forgotten, and by a rare effort of abstraction the loneliness of the spirit was restored."

We shall not stop here to inquire whether this comes nearest to the true idea of preaching. As there are divers gifts among ministers, so, we suppose, there may be many best ways of exercising them in addressing religious assemblies. This one is Mr. Martineau's method. We learn from some who have heard him that he is a dull preacher, and from others that he is the most interesting preacher they have ever listened to. After reading the volume of sermons before us, we can understand this difference of judgment; for few sermons, in their immediate effect, must depend more on the state of mind in which they are heard. They could not, unless accompanied by remarkable powers of oratory, chain down and enforce attention; but rather, like a beautiful evening, if we are in the mood for them, and give ourselves passively up to them, they will steal over us and lift us up, and unfold to us rare visions of spiritual life and joy; while, at another time, we may read on for pages and be attracted by nothing that we find in them.

The character of these discourses we have already intimated. They are not appeals either to our reason or to our passions; but rather, religious meditations on man and the



world, in the midst of a beautiful universe and under the varied experience of actual life. As meditations, they are lofty, beautiful, and sometimes inspiring ; but they do not remind us of the glow of devotion which we find in the writings of St. Paul, still less of the tender affection which breathes out from the words of Jesus. And here, we think, is their defect as a volume of Christian sermons. They are full of reverence, and yet do not lead us to fall on our knees and pray. They are pervaded everywhere by a true regard for the well-being of man, but they do not quicken our affections and bind us by stronger ties of sympathy and love to our fellow-men. They are too purely intellectual, recognizing the beauty of faith and worship and love, but not breathing them into us. They exhibit in terms of pungent severity the folly of our worldly schemes, they point out to us the better way, and show us magnificent prospects opening through an interminable extent of being ; but they do not lovingly take us by the hand and lead us to our Father, or to Jesus, the compassionate Saviour. Indeed, while we find often enough in them the acknowledgment of God as our Father, and of Christ as the purest representative we can have of him, and while one prominent object of the volume is to show that God is not an antiquated being, but now, as much as in the days of Abraham and Moses and Paul, is everywhere present in the world, they do not give us the impression of a Father who is actually with his children, who hears their prayers and has compassion upon them and a near personal connection with them. He is rather an abstract being, an infinite law, a boundless presence, and heaven is shadowy and unreal, rather than a joyous union with God and the spirits of the blessed, such as the heart longs and prays for in its better moments.

In speaking of St. Paul, Mr. Martineau says, — “ His ardent and generous soul had fastened itself on no one living object, but on an abstraction, a thing of his own mind, *the truth*. . . . Christ and God, the objects of his most earnest love, were viewless and ideal here, and would become realities only when death had transferred him to the future.” This seems to us characteristic of Mr. Martineau, as he appears in his writings ; but not of St. Paul. God and Christ can hardly at this hour be to him, in his glorified estate, more dear and awful realities than at the time when he was writing his Epistles ; and it is the warmth of

the emotions, which bound him directly to them as living beings in whose presence he stood, that gives to his words now their peculiar glow and power. To him the two worlds were united in one. If he could not behold the spirit of God, neither could he behold the spirit of his daily companion; but his intensest longings and affections found utterance in prayer, and by prayer he was brought, not into an ideal, but a real, personal relation to God. These walls of flesh seemed dissolved, so that spirit might really commune with spirit. Now this lowly faith, through which the soul is brought nigh unto God, pouring out its fervid petitions, and feeling in its own renovated powers answering returns from his infinite love, so that prayer is not merely a soliloquy in the presence of the Most High, but communing with him, — this lowly, but quickening faith, binding us to God, is what we do not often find in the volume before us, and its partial absence will account for nearly all the deficiencies in the sermons.

The sermon, for example, which is called "The Shadow of Death," is full of just and beautiful thoughts; but it does not come up to our idea of what it should be. It seems to make heaven far off and unreal.

"We look at earth," it says, "as comprising *all* the good which we have ever experienced; we look at heaven as repeating *some*. And though in words we may be assured of the superior intensity of the latter, in thought we can but dwell on it as it has been felt," — p. 43.

"It is not in ordinary human nature to prefer the fragmentary happiness of heaven, as alone it can appear before our thoughts, to the complete and well-known satisfactions of this life in its peaceful attitudes," — p. 44.

"And then, too, the domesticities of life! O God! they would be too much for our religion, were they not themselves in pure hearts a very form of that religion. If we could all go together, there would be nothing in it; but that separate dropping off, — that departing one by one, — that drift from our anchorage alone, — that thrust into a widowed heaven, — who can deny it to be a lonesome thing? It is mere ignorance of the human mind to expect the love of God to overpower all this," — p. 46.

And yet, in thousands of cases, the love of God has overpowered it all. The soul, when most blessed in its earthly affections, has, with a keen sensation of joy, been lifted up to his eternal presence. Heaven is not, to the Christian, made up merely of fragments from our earthly happiness.

What devout and loving spirit, however blessed here, does not seek a closer and dearer sympathy? What earthly affection can satisfy us, so that we yearn for nothing more? Who, when his spiritual desires have once been quickened, and he has known the world as it is, does not, in his loftier musings, rise to the contemplation of a better condition of things, and earnestly long to realize it in his own experience? Who, when once he has cherished these loftier hopes, would not feel a chill running through his whole frame, if it were announced to him that he and his friends should remain here as they now are for ever? Not only the infinite aspirations which rise to God would seek a more perfect union with him as their only rightful consummation, but our social affections would gladly transfer us and those whom we most love to a purer world, and our moral feelings, struggling as in a perpetual warfare here with outward temptations and inward passions, yearn for the final triumph and that higher organization within and without, through which they may attain to perfect peace.

To more heavenly natures, says Mr. Martineau, in another and far nobler discourse, — “The Sorrow with Downward Look,” —

“We attribute a perfect moral beauty, — a godlike symmetry of goodness, — which fills us with reverence, trust, affection, which draws from us the sigh of hope, and refreshes us in the weariness of our harsher life. . . . . This entire coalescence of the order of goodness and the order of desire, this instant and spontaneous adaptation of the will to the conscience through every stage of moral progression, distinguishes our notion of *saintly* excellence, and furnishes our clearest image of a higher world.” — pp. 30, 31.

Again, in yet another discourse, he says, —

“In proportion as our nature rises in its nobleness, does it realize its immortality. As it retires from animal grossness, . . . . as it opens forth into its true intellectual and moral glory, do its doubts disperse, its affections aspire; the veil is uplifted from the future, the darkness breaks away, and the spirit walks in dignity within the paradise of God’s eternity.” — pp. 67, 68.

And to those who have attained to this lofty experience must it be “a lonesome thing” to “drift from their anchorage here,” to join the society of the blessed above, and be united, as they never can be here, with the merciful Father

of all? As to leaving friends, — in those advanced stages of thought and affection, a few years are but as a point; and who can say that death shall make even a temporary separation between us and them?

We have mentioned what we consider the principal defect in the volume. There is another which in a measure runs through it, though it is but once or twice made prominent.

“That clear and single eye,” — we quote from a sermon on “The Single and Evil Eye,” — “filling the soul with light; — what is it but the open thought and conscience by which the truth of heaven streams in? And does not Jesus appeal to this as our only rescue from utter darkness and spiritual eclipse? If so, then men can see for themselves in things divine. They are not required to take on trust a rule of life or faith, in which they would discern no authority and feel no confidence, were it not for the seal it professes to carry, and the affidavit with which it is superscribed. A system, indeed, befriended on the mere strength of its letters of recommendation, misses every thing divine. . . . . If Christ alone had personal and first-hand discernment of the truth and authority of Christianity, and all other men have to take it solely on his word, then Christianity ceases to be a religion. . . . . It is as if God had sent one solitary being, gifted with eyesight, into a world of the blind, to teach them to act *as though they could see.*” — pp. 291, 292.

If all that is meant by this be, that without moral and religious sensibilities in our constitution no religion could have authority with us, we assent to it at once. But if it mean, as we suppose it does, that no revelation from heaven can have such authority with us that we are bound to take it as truth simply on account of the source from which it comes, the position is one wholly at variance with our practice in respect to every other kind of truth. No child could live a day, if it received nothing simply because the parent says it. No ship could cross the sea, even were it commanded by a Bowditch, if those who have charge of it should receive nothing simply because they find it so laid down in works of established authority. Our knowledge of countries which we have not visited is borrowed entirely from others, and we take it on their authority. All that we ask is, that they should be men of veracity, who have had the opportunity of knowing the truth of what they say. Now as God, on the authority of the parent, teaches the child many things before he is able to learn them of himself; as, on the authority of others, he



teaches mariners things essential to their calling, which they could not learn of themselves ; as, on the authority of others, he every day teaches all of us, in matters of historical or geographical interest, truths which we could never learn of ourselves, — why may he not also, on the authority of others, teach us, in matters pertaining to our future existence, truths which we of ourselves could never learn ? There certainly can be no philosophical objection to this. It must, like any other asserted fact, be received or rejected simply according to the evidence by which it is supported.

“ That clear and single eye,” says Mr. Martineau, “ *filling the soul with light.*” But, surely, it is not the *eye* that fills the soul with light. That is but the medium through which the sensation of light reaches the mind. The light itself comes from abroad, and is reflected, not only from the sun, but from every object around. But more than this. The eye may be darkened, and, instead of seeing for itself, must trust entirely to the guidance of others ; or, if it would be healed of its blindness, it must go to one skilled in such things, and, trusting to his authority, without seeing the remedies, submit itself to such treatment as he may prescribe. Now this was the condition in which Jesus found the conscience of the world. He would restore it to a healthy condition. It was too much darkened to judge for itself of the truths which he taught. But, by receiving them on his authority, and applying them as prescribed by him, it might be restored to a healthy condition, and thus at length be able to know, through its own experience, the divine efficacy of that which had first been received solely on trust. This is the attitude in which most of us stand in relation to Christianity. If, as moral and religious beings, we were perfect, a perfect system of morals would commend itself to us by its own light. But we are not so. We are, some of us more and some less, imperfect and sinful beings. Our eye is darkened. We are not a perfect rule to ourselves ; nor are our perceptions of right and wrong so entirely clear, that in every case we can of ourselves judge what is right and what is wrong. We are blinded by habit and the evil customs of the world, and the force of our own appetites and passions. We need, therefore, that a perfect system of moral truth should be held up to us on the authority of one who, we are sure, cannot deceive us ; and as by obedience to him we become more perfect, our moral perceptions will

become more distinct, and we shall become more and more a law to ourselves, verifying, as we advance, by our own experience, the perfect law of Christ. During the period of our pupilage and our partial blindness, we must receive many things on trust. Hence Christianity is to be sought and received by us, at first, on the strength of its external authority ; but, as we grow up into its life, it commends itself more and more to our regenerated faculties, till, of ourselves, we are able to appreciate its divine beauty and its truth.

But we have dwelt, perhaps, too long on these points. The great excellence of the volume before us consists in the pure and lofty ideal of moral and religious duty which it holds up, and before which every thing else appears trivial and almost contemptible. "The Sorrow with Downward Look," "The Christian Doctrine of Merit," "Looking up and Lifting up," are inferior to no sermons of the kind that we have read. "Great Hopes for Great Souls" is in a very elevated strain, and abounds in passages of remarkable brilliancy. It is well that it should come next after the sermon on "The Shadow of Death," as it lifts us entirely above the rather low view of the subject which is there taken.

"Sometimes, indeed," it says, "the last hour of a human life comes on so gentle a wing, that it seems a fit passage of a soul to God ; the feeble pulse which flutters into death, the fading eye whose light seems not to be blotted out, but only to retire within, the fleeting breath that seems to stop, that the spirit may depart in reverent silence, — are like the signs of a contented exchange of worlds, of a mind that has nothing for which to struggle, because it passes to the peace of God." — p. 58.

Then, after mention has been made of doubts awakened by a different aspect of death, we read : —

"But when, by nobler culture, by purer experience, by breathing the air of a higher duty, vitality at length creeps into the soul, the instincts of immortality will wake within us. The word of hope will speak to us a language no longer strange. We shall feel like the captive bird carried accidentally to its own land, when, hearing for the first time the burst of kindred song from its native woods, it beats instinctively the bars of its cage in yearning for the free air that is thrilled with so sweet a strain." — pp. 61, 62.

"Christian Self-Consciousness" is to us the least inter-

esting discourse in the volume. The elaborate, but rather attenuated and unsatisfactory, discussion of Mr. Carlyle's doctrine of self-consciousness adds little to the force of what is said in relation to the dangers of our modern civilization, the main object of the sermon, which is presented with conciseness and power in these words : —

"We must *go and teach this people*. In proportion as their occupations educate them less, and their circumstances tempt them more, a *direct and purposed culture* must be provided ; — a culture which keeps in view the great primary end of responsible existence ; which looks not at their trade, but at their souls, and brings them, not as apt servants to the mill, but as holy children to their God. Education, in the Christian sense, is truly everlasting : childhood preparing for maturity, maturity for age, and the whole of life for death and heaven." — pp. 102, 103.

"The Seven Sleepers" is the quaint title of a very striking sermon ; a little fanciful, however, both in design and execution. The two sermons on "The Sphere of Silence" are both remarkable productions. The former, on Man's Silence, abounds in useful and important suggestions in regard to "things too low to be spoken of," and "things too high to be spoken of" ; the latter, "The Sphere of God's Silence," enters upon a theme too vast for human language. But though we may not receive them as a part of our religious faith, nor perhaps be able to define them exactly, we should be sorry to lose passages like these : —

"The mighty spirits of our race are as the lyric thoughts of God that drop and breathe from his Almighty solitude ; — transient cords flying forth from the strings, as his solemn hand wanders over the possibilities of beauty. One only finished expression of his mind, one entire symmetric strain, has fallen upon our world. In Christ, we have the overflowing Word, the deep and beautiful soliloquy, of the Most High. . . . Not more clearly does the worship of the saintly soul, breathing through its window opened to the midnight, betray the secrets of its affections, than the mind of Jesus of Nazareth reveals the perfect thought and inmost love of the All-ruling God." — pp. 348, 349.

"The Christian Time-View" is a discourse such as only Mr. Martineau could write. We know not where to look for a passage of more rhetorical beauty than the following. It seems to us hardly inferior to Mr. Macaulay's noblest paragraphs.

"The difference between the ancient and modern world is this : that in the one the great reality of being was *now* ; in the other it is *yet to come*. If you would witness a scene characteristic of the popular life of old, you must go to the amphitheatre of Rome, mingle with its eighty thousand spectators, and watch the eager faces of senators and people : observe how the masters of the world spend the wealth of conquest, and indulge the pride of power : see every wild creature that God has made to dwell from the jungles of India to the mountains of Wales, from the forests of Germany to the deserts of Nubia, brought hither to be hunted down in artificial groves by thousands in an hour : behold the captives of war, noble perhaps and wise in their own land, turned loose, amid yells of insult more terrible for their foreign tongue, to contend with brutal gladiators trained to make death the favorite amusement, and present the most solemn of individual realities as a wholesale public sport : mark the light look with which the multitude, by uplifted finger, demands that the wounded combatant be slain before their eyes : notice the troop of Christian martyrs awaiting, hand in hand, the leap from the tiger's den : and when the day's spectacle is over, and the blood of two thousand victims stains the ring, follow the giddy crowd as it streams from the vomitories into the street, trace its lazy course into the forum, and hear it there scrambling for the bread of private indolence doled out by the purse of public corruption ; and see how it suns itself to sleep in the open ways, or crawls into foul dens till morning brings the hope of games and merry blood again ; — and you have an idea of the Imperial people, and their passionate living for the moment, which the Gospel found in occupation of the world. And if you would fix in your thought an image of the popular mind of Christendom, I know not that you could do better than go at sunrise with the throng of toiling men to the hill-side where Whitefield or Wesley is about to preach. Hear what a great heart of reality in that hymn that swells upon the morning air, — a prophet's strain upon a people's lips ! See the rugged hands of labor, clasped and trembling, wrestling with the Unseen in prayer ! Observe the uplifted faces, deep-lined with hardship and with guilt, streaming now with honest tears, and flushed with earnest shame, as the man of God awakes the life within, and tells of him that bare for us the stripe and cross, and offers the holiest spirit to the humblest lot, and tears away the veil of sense from the glad and awful gates of heaven and hell. Go to these people's homes, and observe the decent tastes, the sense of domestic obligations, the care for childhood, the desire of instruction, the neighbourly kindness, the conscientious self-respect ; and say, whether the sacred image of duty does not live within those minds : whether



*holiness* has not taken the place of *pleasure* in their idea of life : whether for them, too, the toils of nature are not lightened by some eternal hope, and their burden carried by some angel of love, and the strife of necessity turned into the service of God. The present tyrannizes over their character no more, subdued by a future infinitely great : and hardly though they lie upon the rock of this world, they can live the life of faith ; and while the hand plies the tools of earth, keep a spirit open to the skies." — pp. 261 – 263.

After the specimens which we have already given, we need say nothing of the extraordinary brilliancy of these sermons. They abound in passages of rare descriptive power, in keen satire, and terse expressions of wisdom.

" In the shipwreck, where Death seizes the storm as his trumpet, and, with the lightning as his banner, comes streaming down the sky." — p. 135.

" The very child, of too transient stay, may paint on the darkness of our sorrow so fair a vision of loving wonder, of reverent trust, of deep and thoughtful patience, that a divine presence abides with us for ever, as the mild and constant light of faith and hope." — pp. 155, 156.

" To walk beneath the porch is still infinitely less than to kneel before the cross. We do nothing well, till we learn our worth ; nothing best, till we forget it. And this will not be, till, besides being built into the real veracious laws of this world, we are also conscious of the inspection of another : till we live, not only fairly among equals, but submissively under the Most High ; and while casting the shadow of a good life on the scene below, lie in the light of vaster spheres above." — p. 205.

" Aptitude for business is not power of Reason ; and a grandee on the exchange may be a pauper in God's universe." — p. 66.

" They live and die on principles purely mercantile ; and the book of life must be a common ledger, if their names are written on its page." — p. 6.

" We seem to have reached an age of soft affections and emasculated conscience, full of pity for pain and disease, of horror at blood and death ; but doubting whether any thing is wicked that is not cruel, and reconciling itself even to that on sufficient considerations of advantage." — p. 182.

Men " who, having made up their minds that Christianity is useful in many ways, and of excellent service in managing the weaker portion of mankind, resolve to patronize it. Well ; — it is an ancient arrogance, lasting as the vanities of the human heart. The Pharisee, it would appear, belongs to a sect never extinct : he lives immortal upon the earth ; and in our day, like

Simon of old, graciously condescends to ask the Lord Jesus to dine!" — p. 166.

With such men life would be "a monster of incongruity; its first volume, a jest-book; its second, a table of interest; and its last, a mixture of the satire and the liturgy." — p. 187.

"Religion is not a didactic thing that words can give, and silence can withhold. It is a spirit; a life; an aspiration; a contagious glory from soul to soul; a spontaneous union with God. Our inward unfaithfulness is sure to extinguish it; our outward policy cannot produce it. To love and to do the Holy Will is the ultimate way, not only to know the truth, but to lead others to know it too." — p. 236.

He who can write in this manner must be a master of our English style, and have at the same time a brilliant, elevated, far-reaching, and vigorous mind. The style, however, though more natural than that of the volume which precedes it, is not well sustained, and is often hard and forced, nor is the thought always consistent with itself. But such flashes of light, such gleams and intervals of clear and holy faith, such moments even as are here revealed of religious elevation and repose, are enough to stamp the volume as an uncommon one, and to mark it out for high uses among men. It has altogether exceeded our expectations, and we rejoice to learn that it has just been republished here.

J. H. M.

---

#### ART. VIII. — THE MEXICAN WAR.\*

THE war between the United States and Mexico is the great political and moral fact of our times. There is no other among the movements, or the results, of the present period, be it ever so hopeful, instructive, or alarming, which equals this either in the immediate interest of its character, or in the importance of its possible, if not probable, consequences. The condition of Ireland is suited to attract the regards of the civilized world, — having its causes, as it doubtless has, in political mismanagement and social degradation reacting on each other. The financial distress of England presents a subject for profound meditation, — suggesting, as it does, so

---

\* *Peace with Mexico.* By ALBERT GALLATIN. New York. 8vo. pp. 34.

many thoughts respecting the principles of trade and the laws of production that underlie the intercourse of modern nations. The position of the Roman Catholic Church, evidently aiming at a recovery of its ancient power, on the one side, by accommodating its domestic policy to the liberal tendencies of the age, and, on the other side, as manifestly bent on establishing its ecclesiastical pretensions to the overthrow of Protestantism in Great Britain and America, offers a spectacle of the deepest interest to the religious or philosophical observer. And the relaxation in the East of those customs which have for ages excluded Christianity from China, and the Mohammedan countries of the Asiatic and African continents, cannot but fill the Christian heart with eager expectation. Still there is no point in the passage of events over the present age which will so signalize it in future times as the war which is now waged between our country and the republic of Mexico, — none to which the historian of a century hence will so confidently refer as the great moral and political fact of the age.

Our present interest in the subject arises out of its moral significance. On account of its relations to the right and the good, and its connection with the character of the people, we believe it may be examined from a point of view above all merely political or party questions. It has been most unhappily admitted or assumed on all sides, that the war cannot be discussed without committing one's self to the support of some one or other of the parties which divide the country. This is a mistake, a palpable and gross mistake. We doubt that we shall say any thing in this article to which men of all parties will not give their assent. At least, we mean to take those positions which shall place us far above the strifes of the partisan orator or the political leader. There is a ground on which all can stand, and from which, looking down upon facts and principles, all must come to the same result.

We begin, then, by saying, what no one will deny, that war is an evil. No one will deny this, for it never has been denied. All persons acknowledge that war is an evil ; a necessary evil, some say, inevitable in the present state of the world ; a useful evil, others maintain, yielding beneficial results that outweigh its pernicious consequences ; but still an evil, — as truly an evil as a pestilence or a conflagration. No one would think of including war among the blessings for

which he would give thanks. The man who should stand up in public and thank God for the war which is devastating Mexico would be accounted more fit for a lunatic asylum than for a pulpit. War is an evil, and every body knows it.

But, further, war is a tremendous evil. It produces and scatters abroad all other evils. It is the real Pandora's box of society. Let loose the energies of war upon a land, and you let loose the worst passions of the human heart and the worst miseries of human experience. War is so great an evil, that it can be justified on principles of morality or of sound policy only in extreme cases, — the most extreme cases. There is not a man from Maine to the mouth of the Mississippi who will hesitate to acknowledge this. State the principle in this form to the military heroes of the world, to Scott, to Wellington, to Soult, and they will assent to it instantly. It must be an extreme case, that shall justify war on principles of morality or of sound policy.

We do not need to press this argument further. We do not ask our readers to adopt the conclusion, that *all* war is unjustifiable. This may be our private opinion, but we are not anxious to establish a theory of non-resistance, because we are persuaded that short of this point it can be made clear, that the war in which we are now engaged should unite the hearts and efforts of the whole people in bringing about its termination.

Does any one, then, pretend that *this* is an extreme case, — that the United States entered into the present war because things had come to extremity? Whatever view may be taken of the circumstances in which it had its origin, or of the motives of those by whom it was encouraged, no one will presume to say, that, on our part at least, there was an actual necessity for the war. Whether it began with an act of aggression on our side or on the side of Mexico, whether they who advocated its commencement hoped to extend the domain of slavery or to enlarge "the area of freedom," whether Mexico owed us an apology or owed us money or owed us both, or whether she had threatened or had committed a trespass on what we considered as our soil and she claimed as hers, no one will affirm that it was one of those extreme cases in which the alternative is war or a worse evil, — a case, for instance, like that presented in our Revolution, as that is usually viewed. An extreme case! Why,



suppose that Mexico, poor, feeble, distracted by internal divisions, owed us some little money which she refused or was unable to pay, and that she had actually sent a few soldiers across a line which we were pleased to adopt as the boundary of our republic, and that she had treated with indignity some of our official agents, does all this constitute one of those exigencies in a nation's affairs which compel her to take up arms? All this, — which did not affect the prosperity of the land, nor endanger its liberty in the least, nor disturb the comfort of one out of ten thousand of its citizens, nor indeed was *known* by one in a thousand except as it was brought to notice in the annual messages of the President! No; there was nothing extreme about it. The very supposition is ludicrous. And however honestly some minds, lost in the mists of diplomatic correspondence or executive responsibility, may have believed that there was no escape from a war, let those same minds now calmly review the circumstances out of which grew the first fatal conflict, and they must confess that there was no *need* of a war, — that an extreme case did not exist.

But the war has been commenced, and been carried on with great determination on both sides. And now it is said, that, however much we may condemn or regret its existence, since it does exist, it must be maintained till its objects are secured. Such a conclusion, however, will not bear the test of morality or of sound policy. We need not pause to inquire what are the objects of the war, though this is an important and pregnant question; for it is sufficient to repeat, that it did not grow out of circumstances creating a moral or political necessity. The same principle, then, which we have already laid down in regard to entering upon a war, holds good in regard to continuing it. That which ought not to be begun, unless an extreme case can be made out, should not be continued, unless the strongest reasons can be presented in justification of its continuance. An evil never becomes less by growth. If it be wrong to open a channel for the passage of a stream, it is wrong to keep that channel open when the stream is every day wearing it deeper and wider. If it be wrong to plant the *Upas* tree, it is wrong not to cut down the sapling. Now the evils of war increase with its continuance, and increase both with an uninterrupted augmentation and at a fearful rate. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that its continuance involves an extreme case of na-

tional safety, it ought most certainly to be abandoned. The obligation to bring it to a close may even be said to be greater than was the obligation to avoid its commencement; and to bring it to a close, not by carrying it on, but by putting an end to hostile proceedings, — not by “conquering a peace,” but by making peace, in the most effectual manner in which a peace can be made, namely, by ceasing to make war. Now will any one pretend that the war with Mexico, at its present stage, involves a case of the kind to which we have alluded? Is there no alternative but the prosecution of this war, or ruin? Is the alternative to which *we* are exposed, war, or subjugation? war, or the annihilation of our commercial prosperity? war, or a paralysis of the national industry? war, or some other tremendous and still greater evil? No. Not a man in the nation will assert that any such alternative lies before us. Be the objects, then, for which the war is prosecuted what they may, they cannot justify its continuance.

By a very simple, and we believe an unanswerable, course of remark, we thus arrive at the conclusion, that the war ought to be brought to a close at once, and by pacific measures. Every thoughtful, honest, Christian man must say so, when he disabuses his mind of the influence which party associations or a conventional standard of morality may, perhaps unconsciously to himself, exert upon it. So strong, however, are the habits of false judgment by which men allow themselves to be controlled, that the simplest truth often needs reiteration and expansion, to give it effect. Multitudes throughout the country, who would find it difficult to withhold their assent from what we have now said, no sooner turn over the page than they relapse into the delusion, that war, though it has its evils, is an indispensable part of a nation's history, needful to the perfection of its character or the culmination of its glory. After every battle that has been fought, from General Taylor's first “glorious success” to General Scott's last “unparalleled achievement,” all the little Peterkins in the land might ask, — “What good came of it?” and of all the old Caspars throughout the twenty-nine States, and of more than half the young Caspars, too, the ballad would run true: —

“‘Why, that I cannot tell,’ said he,  
‘But ’t was a famous victory.’”

It is through this hereditary delusion that the present war ob-

tains its chief hold upon the sympathies of the people, even against their better convictions ; and it is only by continual affirmation of the truth, that the evil spirit of judgment by which they are possessed can be effectually exorcised. We wish, therefore, without the hope of saying any thing new, to present some of those objections to war in general, that warrant the terms of condemnation in which we have spoken of it, and that lie with all their force against this particular war, unless it can be shown to belong to the excepted class of extreme cases.

First, then, we maintain that war is unnatural. We do not mean that there are no elements in human nature, no tendencies or passions, that may be brought to delight in the excitement or the carnage of the battle-field. There are such elements, tendencies, passions, just as there are appetites which incline man to sensual indulgence, and, if gratified without restraint, would make of him a brute. But we should not *describe* man by those appetites. We do not say it is *natural* for him to make himself a beast. Neither is it natural for him to kill his fellow-men, to make himself either a fighting-machine which others direct, or a military hero whom his own savage selfishness impels. War is not the natural state of human society. We might with as much justice affirm that domestic life is artificial, that solitude is man's natural condition. All the higher principles of our nature disown war and protest against it, — all that assimilates us to God, all that elevates us above the brute, all that marks or secures our immortality. Think of a field of battle, — think of the deadly aim, the mortal stab, the fierce onset, the desperate encounter, the shouts of the victors, the shrieks of the dying, the torrents of blood, the infuriate abnegation of humanity, which mark that spot, — will any say, — the boldest or the bravest of those who are mixed in the strife, will they say, that it is natural to man to wear the character which he there presents ? Much nearer the truth was the terrible satire which a writer describing one of the late battles unintentionally uttered, when, as if earth afforded no fit terms in which to commend the courage of the American troops, he said that “ they fought like demons.” Yes, — like demons, even more than like brute beasts ; for to the cruelty of the animal is added the intelligence, if not, for the time, the malignity, of the demon. The soldier, *as a soldier*, denies and discards his humanity. He despises or ignores his own nature.

Yet men in whom we admire many qualities of both heart and mind take up the profession of arms. Undoubtedly ; because the mind turns away, instinctively, from that which forms the peculiarity, the essential distinction, of the military profession, and contemplates only the incidental circumstances that are thought to recommend it. That which distinguishes the military profession, and which makes it important in the eyes of rulers and statesmen, is, that it trains men to fight. Take this away, and you destroy the value of the soldier in a moment. He is worth nothing to the government which employs or feeds him, except as he is capable, or is supposed to be capable, of fighting. And the officers of an army, from the lowest to the highest in rank, are of no value unless they are presumed to be able to conduct the soldiers to battle. Let it be understood that the standing armies of England, France, Russia, or any other power in the Old World, were composed of men who were not prepared to fight, and they would be disbanded in a day. England would not pay a shilling for the support of all her regiments, if she did not regard them as fighting men. What are all the drilling and all the discipline for, but to fit them for the evolutions and the slaughter of the battle-field ? This, however, is an unpleasant idea, one that fills the mind with disgust, rather than offers any allurements, and therefore men dismiss it from their attention, and try to find some fascination in the *circumstances* of a soldier's life, — in the authority and show, on the one side, and the comfort of a public maintenance on the other, and the presumed relation of the military arm, as it is called, to the government or the country, independently of its aptitude for fighting, — a relation, as we have seen, which does not and cannot exist.

Now with reference to this attraction which a military life has for many persons, we allege, as the second objection to war, that the military profession which it sustains — yes, which war, and war alone, sustains — is vulgar. The force of this objection may be felt by those who fall into the common error of regarding the soldier's position and bearing with a feeling akin to envy, as if they placed him somewhat above his fellow-citizens ; and to such persons it is addressed. From whatever point of view we look at the military profession, it is, to our eyes, marked by vulgarity. To fight, if it be not demoniacal or brutal, is, at the best that can be said of it, vulgar. There is nothing noble or generous, nothing which denotes high birth or refined manners, nothing that indicates or



confers superiority of character, in killing a man. It is mean, base work. Homicide at the public command can be but little more praiseworthy than homicide to gratify private revenge. A great number of murders committed at once are not more honorable than the same number of murders committed in detail. But let us pass from the scene of blood to the usual habits of the military profession. Regarded, not through the false light under which the world views it, but through the medium of a correct judgment, these are eminently vulgar, whether we consider them in connection with the officer or the private soldier. The one is a slave, the other a despot ; and there is only one thing more unmanly, more inconsistent with true dignity of character, than to put one's self a passive instrument into the hands of another, and that is, to accept such submission. The military standard of excellence is low, lower than that of the independent day-laborer. The ambition of the officer is a mean ambition, and the motive which induces the private to surrender his self-guidance for clothing and food enough to keep him in good condition is that which effaces the distinction between an intellectual and moral being and a domestic animal. What can be more unworthy of a high-minded man, whether to enforce or to endure, than a discipline maintained by the lash and the brand ? The military profession is vulgar, and it will be so considered when civilization and refinement are really understood.

But war does not even afford a compensation for the debasement of human character and human nature which we ascribe to it ; for, in the third place, it is unprofitable. To the nation which encounters defeat, and is obliged to accept such terms as an enemy may impose, it is, of course, ruinously unprofitable. But the truth is, that most often both of the contending parties come out of the conflict defeated, both impoverished, weakened, and laden with consequences that will be felt by future generations. Where a different termination occurs, and one of the countries which have been engaged in the competition for injury humbles its adversary, and emerges from what is called a successful war, has it been a gainer or a loser ? A child can answer that question. Put down the gain at the highest estimate possible, — increase of territory, contributions to the public treasury, freedom from vexatious demands or unjust annoyance, reputation for military skill and prowess, and an abundant self-satisfaction ; on the other side we must set down the lives of men slain in bat-

tle, or destroyed by the diseases to which their employment exposed them, — the health and labor of those who are incapacitated, by wounds or broken constitutions, for any useful service, — the widows whose husbands have perished, — the fatherless children, — the households bereft of those who, in their young or ripe manhood, might have been the stay of the aged and the feeble, — the derangement, greater or less, often almost universal, of the business of the country, — the effect upon the various employments which it sustains, — the immense sums that have been expended, not as capital to yield a return, but virtually sunk, in carrying on the war, — the influence of a state of warfare on the sentiments and moral judgments of the people, — the deterioration of morals, arising from this cause, and from the dispersion through the land of a large body of men returning from the restraints and the vices of the camp ; set all this down against the gain of the war, and let any one say which is the larger result. Never, except in one of those extreme cases when a nation's independence is in peril, and perhaps not even then, does what is gained in the most successful war compensate for the political, financial, and moral evils which such a war is sure to beget. Let human suffering, human sorrow, and human character be properly estimated, and no tribute that a nation could extort from its conquered foe, or soil that it could annex to its territory, or glory that it could add to its name, would be regarded as an equivalent for the evils, or even deserve to be mentioned in deduction of the evils, which it must have incurred. War is unprofitable, for it seldom secures the object for which it is professedly undertaken, and, except in the rarest instances, involves a cost far beyond the worth of that object.

To add one other reason for discountenancing war, but one that should be decisive with those who accept the religion of Jesus, it is unchristian. If any of our readers ask whether we mean that a Christian cannot be a soldier, or that no real Christians can be found in an army, we hardly need answer, No ; just as if a similar question had been asked in reference to the slave-trade in the last century, or to the sale of intoxicating drinks a few years ago, the reply would have been in the negative. Christianity is but imperfectly understood by many good men. If the advocate or apologist for war demand an exhibition of texts in which it is condemned by the Christian religion, we maintain that we have a much more conclusive evidence in the spirit and purpose of the Gospel and

the character of Christ. Who entertains a doubt that Christianity breathes a pacific spirit, or that the design of the Gospel is such an amelioration of human character as shall produce universal peace? Or who does not hesitate, nay, who does not find it impossible, to associate Jesus with scenes of strife and bloodshed? This is sometimes treated as an unfair test; but we hold it to be both pertinent and decisive. We can imagine Jesus, without doing violence to our reverence for his character, in scenes of want or of vice, administering relief and reproving sin; we can imagine him in scenes of traffic or in schools of education, sanctioning, by his presence, the prosecution of an honest business, or encouraging the discipline of the intellectual powers. But we cannot, by any effort of the imagination, represent him to ourselves as leading men to battle or giving his countenance to the shock of arms. We cannot, by any process of combination, connect the qualities of a military chieftain with Jesus Christ. Yet we are taught to be like him, — to seek the nearest possible resemblance to him, — to imbibe his spirit, — to wear his image, — to express his character. Words could not more plainly declare that the soldier and the Christian, when construed in their true sense, are terms that stand in opposition to each other. Whether we examine the religion which Christ came to establish in the world, as it appears in his teaching, in his example, or in the writings and lives of his apostles, we can arrive at only one conclusion, that Christianity has no sympathies nor promises — we might almost say, no prayers — for those who seek to distress and kill, instead of forgiving, their enemies. It is true, indeed, that our Lord did not make war a distinct subject of instruction; but he did what he knew would be more effectual, — he left an influence on earth that is directly and irreconcilably hostile to the tempers and reasonings on which war rests for its support. As Christianity shall prevail, it must supersede alike brute force and military skill. As it shall penetrate the institutions of society and the action of governments, it must put an end to the policy which accepts war as a method of gaining redress of injuries. And when it shall become universal, both as a profession and an influence, it will put an end not only to war, but to all the preparations for war. Every one believes this. How, then, can we escape from the conclusion, that war is unchristian? Christianity does in effect reject and condemn it on every page of its own records; and they

who would follow Christ, taking up his cross, must bear their testimony, in speech and in act, by what they say and by what they do or refrain from doing, against a custom which finds no attribute in the religion or character of Jesus that can lend it support.

We might add much more in justification of our belief, that we ought in every way to discountenance war, whether as an institution, or as an occasional employment of men's physical and mental energies. Such views, we know, find little favor, even with the more thoughtful and candid part of the community, especially when a country is involved in war; for then, as we have already said, it seems to be considered the duty of a good citizen to give whatever aid he can in prosecuting the war till his country's rights are secured. We might linger over this expression, and show how little the *rights* of a country often have to do with the continuance of a war, into which it may have been led by a mistaken sense of what was due to its honor. Let the flame of war be kindled, and right is apt to be forgotten, — and honor too. Success is now the word in men's mouths, and conquest the end sought. So easily is the judgment depraved under the fearful temptation of an actual war! Hostilities once commenced, the original matters in dispute are scarcely kept in mind. We may not dwell on this point, however, but turn from it to explain the moral phenomenon, as it may well be termed, of support given to a war by persons who disapproved of its commencement. There are two ways of accounting for such inconsistency. First, the feelings become interested in the progress of the war, precisely as in the progress of a story which we read. As the months bring reports of successive movements, and the public journals are filled with details of battles or the conjectures of those at a distance, we gradually come to take an interest in what is passing on the scene of strife. Our curiosity is awakened, expectation and calculation are called into exercise, and we insensibly lose our moral estimation of the war in the excitement which it gives to the mind. At this period, the patriotic sentiment begins to manifest itself, — a sentiment having its foundation in our nature, but often mistaking its proper objects. The war becomes now a matter in regard to which we feel some solicitude, on account of the relation which our countrymen and our national reputation and national character bear to it. If our troops are defeated, we begin to have some feelings of



mortification and resentment. If they prevail, we experience emotions of satisfaction and triumph. By this simple process do we, before we know it, become involved in the interest of actual participants in the danger and the sin ; our moral perceptions are clouded ; and men, who, a short time ago, sat in stern judgment on the proceedings of their rulers, are now almost ready to adopt that detestable maxim, subversive, at least in its obvious sense, of all justice, honor, and humanity, — “ Our country, right or wrong.”

Add to this another influence which acts strongly on most minds. There must be displayed, in the conduct of armies and the successful issue of a battle, qualities suited to inspire confidence and admiration. There must be coolness, bravery, judgment, address, and a general power of seizing on circumstances and turning them to advantage. We do not wonder at the applause lavished on military prowess. As long as men allow themselves to be blinded by force of character, or dazzled by mere success, they will be ready to swell the praises of any one who achieves a victory on the field of battle, or to gaze with eager eyes on the career of one who is carrying conquest and desolation over an enemy's soil. We are tempted to bestow our admiration, in such a case, on precisely the same ground on which we are compelled to admire the resolution and impious audacity of Milton's Satan. We observe force, — force of will, of purpose, of perseverance, — and force commands, and must command, respect. They who would turn contemptuously from the mere physical force of the savage will abase themselves before the force of character which is shown by a military hero. It is a natural tendency of man ; and when with it is joined the disposition to take success as a measure of right, which is so common, the sad consequence of their union is, that the moral sense is confused, the conscience is bewildered, and men find themselves sustaining and applauding what, a little time before, they were loud in condemning. The popular delusions respecting the character of war then begin to mislead the mind, and the notion is entertained, that the honor of the country depends upon humbling the *enemy*, as the nation with which we have sought or accepted a bloody quarrel is styled, according to a use of language which Christianity never did, and never will, own ; and with it creeps into the mind the appreciation of things which calls that glorious, on which God and angels look down with unmingled displeasure. Then follows the sacrifice of all

philanthropic sentiment on the altar of a spurious patriotism ; and it is thought right to imprecate and to bring upon our fellow-men calamities, the very mention of which in connection with our own citizens makes us shudder, — to rejoice at the distress and desolation which we should regard as an occasion of the deepest mourning, if they were transferred to our own land, — as if there were no permanent moral qualities, but the character of an action depended on its domestic or foreign origin. By these steps, how easily does one pass from an honest condemnation of a war to a virtual or open defence of it ! True, there is a terrible demoralization going on meanwhile, and the individual is unconsciously losing his hold on rectitude of principle and parting with his own integrity. But the very causes which produce such injury to the character prevent his perceiving it. He knows not how great a misfortune is his sympathy with the state of feeling about him.

And this is the most lamentable of all the consequences of a war, — the people are demoralized without knowing it. Their standard of character sinks, the moral tone of their discourse becomes less firm and true, their principles grow lax and conventional. The effect is but the more deplorable, that it is insidious. Men slide off from the position which they once held, and with an accelerated speed tend to that plane of morality on which the opinions and practices of the world attempt to meet the commandments of God ; not, however, by changing their own character so as to harmonize with those commandments, but by interpreting the revelations of duty which are given through conscience and through Christ according to the maxims of expediency or the license of equivocation and compromise. This is the most disastrous blight which war can cast upon a land, — a blight upon the moral perceptions and sensibilities of a people, — worse than defeat in arms, worse than commercial embarrassment, worse than poverty, worse even than political servitude ; for a nation would better remain faithful to God, though it lose its civil liberties, than retain its political institutions at the expense of its loyalty to the divine principle of rectitude. Better lose any thing than lose character. It is as true of a nation as of an individual. Power, prosperity, liberty, is nothing without virtue. When, therefore, we see a country deteriorating in character beneath the infliction of war, we are justified in saying that the greatest curse which even this demon evil could shed upon it has taken effect.

The smitten people lie in shame,  
The contrast of their former name ;  
The poison through their veins has spread,  
The land is filled with living dead.

It is such a demoralizing influence which is already disclosing itself in connection with the Mexican war. Our people have imbibed the poison, even as the traveller inhales the fatal miasma, without knowing it. A deterioration of character is going on among us. It may seem to relate only to this one subject ; but can the convictions and sentiments of a people become depraved on one point, and the corruption not affect the whole character ? If men learn to evade the eternal laws of duty in one instance, they have no security against similar treachery in any other case, when a sufficient temptation shall arise. Let national vanity or national ambition urge them to the prosecution of a war which they once considered a crime against freedom and justice, against man and God, and they will soon throw justice and piety to the winds, and take no guide but their own passions. The depravation of public sentiment on this subject, therefore, we regard as the most grievous of all the effects which the present war has brought upon the country. The expenditure of millions, never to be recovered, is as nothing. The loss of thousands of lives and the grief of untold households are comparatively light calamities. Even the new impulse which has been given to that determination, compounded of fanaticism and interest, which upholds the institution of slavery, we account a much less evil than the wide-spread infection which has tainted the moral judgment of the people respecting the wickedness of war.

It seems to us but voluntary blindness to deny this deterioration of public sentiment. We hear it in every day's conversation. We read it in almost every political journal. Nay, the religious papers of the land give in to that same pernicious and unpardonable exultation at the brilliant achievements of our troops, as they are called, and the unparalleled skill and bravery of our generals, which is the frequent burden of the secular press. Who does not see that the language of the country has greatly changed within the last six months ? With an earnest profession of abhorrence of the war is now joined an admiration of the manner in which it has been conducted, that dilutes the meaning, and must destroy the effect, of that profession of abhorrence. Why !

the war is not a whit less open to objection now, while our flag floats upon the legislative halls of the unhappy country which we have overrun, than it was when the sword was first drawn on the banks of the Rio Grande. The judgment which must be passed upon it, as a war that was not required by the exigency of the case, is not affected by the fact that our troops have at every step fought their way through resistance to conquest, without meeting with a single defeat. The merits of such a warfare do not depend on the success of either of the parties. Yet the tone of remark, or of feeling rather, which is betrayed in almost every quarter, discovers a secret delight, a pride, a gratification at least, which a correct moral taste would at once disown. We speak not now of those who early favored the war, more than of those who were its strenuous opposers. The change which has come over the latter is even more remarkable and more sad, — we will not say, more culpable, for that would be to question the political sincerity of one or the other party, — but it is more worthy of notice, and must cause a deeper feeling of anxiety, than the maintenance of their ground by those who advocated the commencement of hostilities. “It would seem,” says Mr. Gallatin, “as if the splendid and almost romantic successes of the American arms had, for a while, made the people deaf to any other consideration than an enthusiastic and exclusive love of military glory.” We hope this is too strong an expression of the fact; and yet this very sentence shows that the writer himself is not insensible to the wild charm of martial enterprise. Take the country through, there certainly is not that deep and spontaneous disapproval of war in itself considered, which, we believe, prevailed five years, or two years, since. The cause of peace, of Christian and universal peace, has lost ground which it may be long before it will recover.

But, further, a progressive change of sentiment on the general subject of war is not the only sign of moral deterioration. We have become familiar with the cruelties and vices of warfare. Tales of bloodshed, which once made our ears to tingle, we can now hear without emotion. The sickening and horrible details of the battle-ground can now be read without making us sick at heart or striking us with horror. The language in which the atrocities that attend the bombardment or capture of cities, or the collision of forces in the mingled fight, have been described, is enough to thrill



the soul with pity and terror ; yet, if noticed, it is but faintly and rarely censured. The splendor of the achievement and the success of the enterprise confuse the moral discernment, and we are growing familiar with bloodshed and rapine, as those who feast their imaginations on the licentious literature of France or England learn to think lightly of violations of decency in speech or act. The "general tendency" of the war is "to make man hate man, to awaken his worst passions, to accustom him to the taste of blood."\* We are feeling the effects here in New England, two thousand miles from the scene of strife, feeling it in the social atmosphere which we breathe, feeling it in our homes. Our children are babbling the language of the "bloody field." Our purity, our gentleness, our refinement, are wearing away beneath the continual attrition of "news from Mexico." Our political morality is sinking, when it should be rising. We are unjust to those who hold conscience to be a higher law than either interest or party. We are transmitting to another generation unsound principles and an impure example.

Therefore do we affirm that this war should be brought to a close. Whatever we may gain by it, — be it the whole of Mexico as a subjugated province or as one in the sisterhood of our United States, or be it the quiet possession of Texas, with the command of hundreds of miles of the Pacific coast, — it cannot be a compensation for what we shall lose, and are every day losing, of sound judgment, moral principle, Christian sensibility and national character. The war ought to cease. It had no sufficient justification at its commencement ; it can have none now. And its termination must be effected through the decision of the religious people of the land. The politicians of America and the warriors of Europe may see in it a series of brilliant events which reflect glory on our name, but the consistent Christian will see in it only occasion for shame and grief. There is no glory in it or about it. They who have chosen to enter its scenes of carnage must answer as they can, not to their country, but to their Saviour and their God ; and they who have been sent thither to slay or be slain, as the fortunes of war might determine, and who have obeyed an authority which they considered it dishonorable to contradict, deserve our pity for the fate into which they have been driven. It remains for the

---

\* *Peace with Mexico*, p. 27.

Christian people of this land, rising above all considerations of party politics or fictitious patriotism, to demand a cessation of hostilities. We admire the title of Mr. Gallatin's pamphlet, — "Peace with Mexico." And because this is its title, and this its object, we have made our present article to stand in connection with it. With the political and historical argument, which fills the greater number of its pages, we have no concern. To the questions on which the administration and its opponents are at issue, in regard to the origin of the war, we have made no reference, not only because the discussion to which they would tempt us might be foreign from the purposes of our journal, but because we hope that persons entertaining different views on these points may be brought to concur upon what is now the question of pressing interest, — whether the war shall continue. Let "the friends of peace," let the friends of humanity, of civilization, of religion, the friends of their country who care more for its character than for its extent, "unite, boldly express their opinions, and use their utmost endeavours in promoting an immediate termination of the war." "At present, the only object is peace, immediate peace." \*

For any one, who has no personal knowledge of the perplexities of public men, to suggest what particular course should be taken for bringing the war to a close, may be useless or impertinent. But the one right course seems to us so plain and so effectual, that we cannot but repeat the indication of it which has been given by others. It is described in a single line. *We must retrace our steps.* In the language of the memorial to Congress, which has probably been presented to most of our readers for signature, we must "withdraw our troops from the territory of Mexico, restore to her possession the provinces which we now occupy, offer the amplest atonement in our power for all wrongs which may have been inflicted on her, and, if necessary, appoint commissioners empowered to adjust questions in dispute between these two sister republics." There is nothing in these terms to which the most earnest supporter of the war ought to object. If our purpose was to humble or crush Mexico, have we not done it? If our purpose was to show the world that we could resent an insult, or that we could defend our rights at the point of the sword, have we not done it? Have we

---

\* *Peace with Mexico*, p. 33.

not proved that our troops are brave, as the world calls bravery, and our generals equal in military resource to the marshals of the Old World? If our purpose was to heal our wounded honor, so far as the infliction of disgrace and suffering on our adversary can promote that end, the wound will never bleed again. Our troops can now safely and honorably return to their own country; — safely, for an army of ten thousand men can surely march without danger over that road now open to its passage along which a less number fought their way against a far superior force; and honorably, because no one can impute our retreat to cowardice or any other than a generous motive.\* The provinces which have been wrested from Mexico may be restored to her without any imputation on our character for courage or consistency; for what do we want of them? They can do us no good, and may make us much trouble. And having shown her that she was unable to protect them against the determination of our soldiers, we may now convince her and the world that neither ambition nor avarice prompted us to seek their acquisition. We have certainly inflicted some wrongs upon her, for there never was a war in which both parties were not guilty of injustice and cruelty. Let us repair *our* wrongs, and set an example which she may be glad to follow. The course which we ought to pursue is plain, and it will be effectual. It must be effectual. Let it be tried promptly and sincerely. Let the President and his cabinet concur with Congress in adopting it. And that they may be assured of the approbation of the people, at least of the moral and religious and Christian portion of the people, let memorials go up to Congress from every place, importuning them to put an end to the war. Let the whole Christian population of the land appear, through the expression of their solemn will, at the doors of the national legislature, and, with a voice whose calm strength shall cause its echoes to reverberate from wall to wall of the capitol, declare that the war must cease, — *the war must cease*.

And when that will shall have been obeyed, — and, under such circumstances, it would be obeyed, — and this war shall

---

\* "Though so dearly purchased, the astonishing successes of the American arms have at least put it in the power of the United States to grant any terms of peace without incurring the imputation of being actuated by any but the most elevated motives. It would seem that the most proud and vain must be satiated with glory, and that the most reckless and bellicose should be sufficiently glutted with human gore."—*Peace with Mexico*, p. 30.

have been brought to a close, we may again have hope for humanity and the Gospel. By such an example we might do much to repair the damage we have inflicted on the cause of righteousness and peace. In that moral providence of God which permits man to retrieve his own errors, and turn even his sins into means of good for himself and for others, we may more than repair the injury we have done. We may show how noble is adherence to justice, not amidst misfortune, but against the seductions of success. We may teach the world the height and shape of true honor. We may secure for our tarnished name a brightness that shall startle even jealous Europe into admiration. "A more truly glorious termination of the war, a more splendid spectacle, an example more highly useful to mankind at large, cannot well be conceived, than that of the victorious forces of the United States voluntarily abandoning all their conquests, without requiring any thing else than that which was strictly due to our citizens."\* And who will venture to say that such an example would not be felt throughout Christendom and in future ages? In spite of the glare which war throws about its heroes and its achievements, the world is growing tired of "the confused sound of the warrior and garments rolled in blood," of beleaguered cities and wasted villages, of slaughtered men and desolated homes, of bloodshed and hatred. It is even now groaning to realize in its own experience the manifestation of that law which was given for universal obedience by the Saviour of all mankind, — "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Let us hasten to present an exhibition of its meaning, and we know not how many hearts will leap in sympathy. Other nations may rejoice to imitate the young, but manly and Christian, republic of America; and the time may approach, may ere long arrive, when all shall confess, in their application of this great law of love, that our neighbour is not our countryman alone, nor a "*suffering*" fellow-creature, "though at the farthest pole," but that man is our neighbour, — man, of whatever nation and in whatever condition.

E. S. G.

---

\* *Peace with Mexico*, p. 30.



## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*The Great Atonement.* By HENRY SOLLY, Author of "Walter Bernard," and "The Midnight Cry." London: John Chapman. 1847. 12mo. pp. 164.

THIS little volume vindicates and turns to practical use the true Christian interpretation of one of the sublimest doctrines of the New Testament. The doctrine of Reconciliation is made by the author to be as engaging and of as serious moment to our minds as the doctrine of Atonement, in the Calvinistic sense of it, is to its believers. Mr. Solly presents no new view, but he gives distinctness and interest to a view which has been repeatedly presented with great force. He maintains, with all arguments of reason and Scripture on his side, that the doctrine of Atonement has become as much perverted from its original meaning in Christendom as has the etymology of the word itself. In an Appendix, he adduces sufficient proof that the word Atonement meant, at the time our version of the Scriptures was made, simply at-one-ment, or reconciliation. In the body of his book, after developing this true scheme of Atonement, he traces its processes through Faith, Sorrow, Love, and Joy. We hope that some one of our publishers may reprint this book, for it is a valuable contribution, as well to our controversial, as to our practical religious literature.

E.

---

*Evangeline, a Tale of Acadie.* By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. Fifth Edition. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 1848. 16mo. pp. 163.

PROFESSOR Longfellow's new poem has already, within the brief space of two months, reached a fifth edition,—a fact which indicates a greater degree of popularity, we believe, than has been attained by any other American poem. This is to be ascribed partly to his great success in overcoming those difficulties of the "inexorable hexameter" which have proved insuperable to every other English or American writer who has attempted to compose a long poem in this measure, and partly to the intrinsic beauty of the work itself. The story of *Evangeline* is marked by great simplicity and a strict accordance with the historical facts, as recorded in Haliburton's "Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia," and in the early French writers; but the chief interest which the reader feels arises from the admirable delineation of the several characters, the minute and truthful de-

scriptions of rural life and natural scenery, and the rare beauty of the similes. The characters are drawn with a vigorous, but delicate touch, so that even the great master,

"that left half told  
The story of Cambuscan bold,"

could hardly improve upon the sketch of Basil, the blacksmith, of René, the notary public, or of Benedict, Evangeline's father; while the heroine is scarcely inferior to any character that we remember to have met with in imaginative literature. She presents a perfect example of a loving, trusting, hoping, patient, suffering woman. The pictures of pastoral life are as minute as Crabbe's descriptions, and far more poetical. The first part of the poem describes the condition of the early French settlers of the village of Grand-Pré, and their most unjustifiable removal by the New England troops, after the total destruction of their homes. The second part, which contains the account of Evangeline's wanderings in search of her lost lover, wrought out of the poet's own imagination, will, we suppose, be generally regarded as the most beautiful. It is, indeed, full of admirable conceptions, and is superior, we think, to any thing that Mr. Longfellow has before written. s.

---

*Artist Life, or Sketches of American Painters.* By HENRY T. TUCKERMAN, Author of "Thoughts on the Poets," etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1847. 12mo. pp. 237.

HERE are lively and interesting notices of some of our native artists. To describe their character in a word, we should say that they are remarkably *accurate*. In every instance, we clearly discern the very man whom the writer aims to exhibit. Faithful likenesses are presented,—we see at once the peculiarities of each individual's genius and actual life. No friend of Sully could fail to recognize, in the few pages devoted to him, a complete portrait of one whose cheerful presence and happy artistic gifts won upon all hearts that came within the circle of his influence. The criticisms are always discriminating, but, to our mind, not sufficiently enthusiastic. When a writer who loves and appreciates art passes from West and Trumbull to Allston, we expect to see new fires kindled by the new atmosphere which he breathes. Still the book possesses a quite substantial merit. It preserves the lineaments of a number of our best artists, some of whom are destined to exert no small influence in shaping the destinies of the New World. c.

*A Reply to Doctor Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," so far as the Churches of the English Communion are concerned.* By SAMUEL FARMAR JARVIS, D. D., LL. D., Historiographer of the Church, etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1847. 12mo. pp. 251.

THIS volume shows no inconsiderable learning and acuteness. As proof of the candor and honesty of the writer, we may mention the fact, that he denies the genuineness of 1 John v. 7, and presents a good summary of the evidence against it. We commend the book to the attention of those who have ever read Milner's "End of Religious Controversy," pronounced by Charles Butler the ablest work in defence of the Roman Catholic Church in the controversy with Protestants, which had appeared in the English language.

L.

*The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge, for the Year 1848.* Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 12mo. pp. 370.

*The Unitarian Congregational Register, for the Year 1848.* Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1848. 12mo. pp. 70.

It is impossible to give, in a short notice, any idea of the great amount of information to be derived from the American Almanac, well vindicating its title to be called a "Repository of Useful Knowledge." The past numbers have abundantly established its character as a "trustworthy manual of reference." On several subjects, the present volume is more full and complete than its predecessors. Among the articles of interest and value, we may mention those on the Observatory at Washington and the great Telescope at Cambridge, an abstract of the laws of the several States concerning Imprisonment for Debt, the chapters on the Patent-Office, on the history of the Electric Telegraph, and on Railroads. The meteorological tables embrace, besides the usual matter, the "flowering seasons," and "days and depth of snow, for a series of years, in several places."

We are grateful alike for some of the additions and some of the omissions in the "Unitarian Congregational Register." The compiler has done well to insert the term "Congregational" in the title, the Unitarians belonging to the great body of Congregational Christians, the attempts sometimes made to deprive them of the name notwithstanding. The Register contains many valuable statistics of the denomination, and at the close, in a series of extracts, some exposition of its doctrines. We think the present a decided improvement upon the similar publications of the two preceding years.

L.

*Titus Livius: Selections from the First Five Books, together with the Twenty-first and Twenty-second Books entire; chiefly from the Text of Alschefski. With English Notes for Schools and Colleges.* By J. L. LINCOLN, Professor of Latin in Brown University. With an accompanying Plan of Rome, and a Map of the Passage of Hannibal. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1847. 12mo. pp. 329.

To the teachers and lovers of classical literature, as well as to those of the rising generation who are destined to cultivate an acquaintance with the Latin language and authors, we think Professor Lincoln has rendered an acceptable service. Some thirty years ago, and until a much later period, a volume containing the first five Books of Livy, without note or comment, was the first Latin classic put into the hands of the student after entering college. Provided with an abridgment of Ainsworth, Adam's Latin Grammar, and a translation, if he could get it, — though this was a thing not of easy acquisition, — he commenced his labors upon the author who held him longest and on whom the greatest amount of diligent, profitable study was bestowed. Mr. Folsom's publication afforded some relief in this state of need, but, as intimated in the preface of the present volume, it lacks that copious provision of notes which is believed to be necessary to supply the wants of the student. Professor Lincoln's notes are probably the result of difficulties gradually and successively observed, mastered, and noted down, as occasions presented them in the course of his instruction; in which work, as well as in settling the text, he has been assisted materially, no doubt, by the recent edition of the "distinguished European scholar" (Alschefski) to whom he refers. He acknowledges his indebtedness to many other restorers and expositors of Livy of high credit. His map, showing the route of Hannibal over the Alps, and another exhibiting a plan of ancient Rome, we conceive to be valuable helps, for which the student will thank him.

The notes possess one admirable characteristic in their brevity. Of all the obstacles which have served to paralyze the interest of the student and to obstruct the progress of classical knowledge, we think those interminable pages of rubbish and stupidity with which critics and commentators have loaded the text they have undertaken to explain are the most lamentable. Classical learning will never have a true existence till critics, editors, and lexicographers can, in a few clear, intelligible, vernacular words, tell us what little their labors have brought to light. If they have found out any thing worth knowing, they can communicate it without what the aborigines call "a long talk." Every intelligent reader knows what a clog it is to his progress in attaining the sense or preserving the interest of his author, to be incessantly bothered



with references to the bottom of the page or the end of the book, when both text and notes are in his own tongue. The most desirable editions of Shakspeare we conceive to be those recent ones, in which, in the majority of cases, a single word gives us all the light we want. Who, then, will wade through an endless jargon of Latin annotations, for modern Latin deserves no better designation, to get what information five words or lines of modern English, French, or German might communicate? It is worse than searching two bushels of chaff to find two grains of wheat. Gray's Latin *morceaux* have been much admired, but only as imitations of Horace and Lucretius, as specimens of the ingenuity and taste of an accomplished man of letters. Few will regret that his "*Ars Cogitandi*" was left unfinished. Buchanan's version of the Psalms, executed with Horatian felicity, is a tedious book to read. Why attempt to resuscitate a dead language? Have we not a whole Babel of spoken and written tongues, with their respective literatures, now? Even the classics themselves are valuable chiefly as relics of what was once, in ages of a far remote antiquity, the intellectual and literary life of their times, times connected with succeeding periods down to our own, and casting back a faint glimmer of light into times earlier still and illuminated only by the uncertain rays of tradition and fable.

F.

---

*Practical Physiology; for the Use of Schools and Families.*

By EDWARD JARVIS, M. D. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwaite, & Co. 1847. 12mo. pp. 368.

THIS work deserves, and will undoubtedly obtain, a high rank in that class of productions among which it is the author's intention that it shall be placed. It is a hand-book of physiology, and compliance, from youth to age, with its instructions will tend to guide us healthily and happily through life, enabling us to avoid many of the rough paths and painful incidents which we are too apt to consider as inseparable from our earthly pilgrimage. With some of the most important precepts which this science inculcates, all who are capable of understanding them should be perfectly familiar; for without such knowledge we are as unfit to take proper care of ourselves, or of others, as we were before our release from the nursery. If instruction of the kind given in this book were more widely diffused, and made to hold a more prominent place in early education, many an hour of suffering and much sickness would be prevented. That these evils are often unnecessary, and are the penalties we pay for our ignorance on this important subject, is a fact on which we cannot too strongly insist. A treatise like the present must comprehend a certain

amount of information concerning the structure of the human frame, those chemical laws which are more immediately connected with the changes constantly going on within us, and the influence which these exert upon the whole physical system, with an especial reference to their effect upon the mind itself. The work before us is peculiarly adapted to enlighten the youthful reader on these points. It is full of valuable information, and contains many useful facts, drawn from a great number of larger volumes, and freed from the abstruse and complicated matter with which, in works of a more purely scientific character, they are necessarily mingled. These are presented to the youthful reader in a style at once attractive, clear, comprehensive, and practical.

B—n.

*The Gospel of To-day. A Discourse delivered at the Ordination of T. W. Higginson, as Minister of the First Religious Society in Newburyport, Mass., Sept. 15, 1847.* By WILLIAM HENRY CHANNING. Together with the Charge, Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the People. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 63.

*Dangers of a Business Life. A Sermon preached at the Church of the Saviour, Brooklyn, N. Y., Sunday, September 19, 1847.* By FREDERIC A. FARLEY, Pastor. New York. 1847. 8vo. pp. 8.

*The Death of Little Children. A Sermon, preached at Brighton, Sunday Morning, September 19, 1847.* By FREDERIC A. WHITNEY, Minister of the First Church. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 15.

*Two Years in the Ministry; or Farewell Discourses, comprising, I. Views of the Nature and Sources of True Christian Theology; and, II. Views of the Nature of the Christian Religion, and Salvation by Christ. Delivered September 26, 1847, on leaving the Second Congregational Society in Southington, Conn.* By JAMES RICHARDSON, JR., A. M., Pastor of the First Congregational Society, Haverhill, Mass. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 58.

*Relation of Christianity to Human Nature. A Sermon preached at the Ordination of Mr. Frederick N. Knapp, as Colleague Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Brookline, Mass., on Wednesday, October 6, 1847.* By HENRY W. BELLOWS, Pastor of the Church of the Divine Unity, in New York City. Together with the Charge and Right Hand of Fellowship. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 47.

*The Good Judge. A Sermon preached at the Federal Street Meetinghouse, October 17, 1847, after the Death of Hon. Ar-*

*temas Ward, LL. D.* By EZRA S. GANNETT, Pastor of the Federal Street Church. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 24.

*A Discourse delivered before the Autumnal Unitarian Convention, held at Salem, Mass., Wednesday Evening, October 20, 1847.* By GEORGE W. BRIGGS, Junior Minister of the First Church in Plymouth, Mass. Boston: B. H. Greene. 8vo. pp. 31.

*The Guilt of Contempt. A Sermon, preached in the Union Street Brick Church of the Independent Congregational Society, Bangor, Me., on Sunday Afternoon, October 24, 1847.* By HENRY GILES. Bangor. 1847. 8vo. pp. 16.

*The True Position of the Church in Relation to the Age. A Discourse delivered at the Dedication of the Church of the Saviour, Wednesday, November 10, 1847.* By the Pastor, R. C. WATERSTON. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1847. 8vo. pp. 40.

*The American Citizen; his True Position, Character, and Duties. A Discourse, delivered before the Senate of Union College, at Schenectady, 26th July, 1847.* By THEODORE SEDGWICK. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1847. 8vo. pp. 36.

*Fame and Glory. An Address before the Literary Societies of Amherst College, at their Anniversary, August 11, 1847.* By CHARLES SUMNER. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 8vo. pp. 51.

*An Introductory Lecture, delivered at the Massachusetts Medical College, November 3, 1847.* By OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, M. D., Parkman Professor of Anatomy and Physiology. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 1847. 8vo. pp. 38.

MR. CHANNING'S Discourse is marked by great vitality and energy; it is full of "thoughts that breathe and words that burn"; many will pronounce it visionary, or describe it as tinctured with a subtle mysticism, yet few can read it, we should think, without finding their souls stirred and elevated. — Mr. Farley's is a purely practical discourse. The "dangers of a business life" are pointed out, being its tendencies to promote selfishness, to cause religion to be separated from "common occupations," the standard of character to be lowered, and the future to be forgotten in the present. — Mr. Whitney's Sermon on "the death of little children" opens those Christian views on the subject which appeal at once to the affections and to faith, and which, duly meditated upon, become a source of strength in trial and means of growth in the spiritual life. — Although we by no means coincide with some of the views presented by Mr. Richardson on subjects of which, though requiring profound thought and careful analysis, he has disposed

in a somewhat summary manner, there are parts of his Discourses which are very effective, his warm and glowing style adding to the natural force of the thought. — If we understand Mr. Bellows, of which we are not quite sure, we cannot accept all his statements, at least without important qualifications; but he may, possibly, be right and we wrong; at all events, we like his free, earnest utterance. — Jesus, says Mr. Briggs, did not directly assail error, but made his appeal to great spiritual truths, and we must do the same; this is his first topic: his second is the “regeneration of the life,” by bringing the “heart into direct contact with the eternal truth,” or the “direct application of truth to the principles of the individual and the age.” His Discourse is marked by great fervor, the sentiment is pure and reverently Christian, but one or two points we should prefer to state in a somewhat different form. — The Sermon by Mr. Giles on “contempt of humanity in any form of man” is marked by his peculiar and fervid eloquence, his keen power of analysis, and vivid conceptions of the fit, the beautiful, and the good. — Mr. Waterson speaks of the source of a true theology, to be found in the Gospel of Jesus miraculously attested; he then turns to the “civilization and philanthropy of the times,” and the position of the church in regard to them, noticing especially slavery and war; and lastly refers to the “wants of individual man,” — a reverential faith and Christian seriousness being prominent characteristics of the Discourse.

Mr. Sedgwick’s Discourse, on “the true position, character, and duties of the American citizen,” is full of wisdom drawn from the storehouse of history and from careful meditation; it is rich in thought and appropriate illustration, and altogether we hesitate not to pronounce it a noble discourse on a noble theme. — Mr. Sumner, in his brilliant Address before the “Literary Societies of Amherst College,” passes in review the common notions of fame and glory; he then discusses the questions, — “to what extent, if any,” glory is “a proper and commendable motive of conduct, or object of regard,” — and “what are true fame and glory, and who are the men most worthy of honor.” The performance is rich in historical and classical allusions, and in its tone eminently Christian. — Dr. Holmes, in his Introductory Lecture, touches upon many topics connected with the present state of the medical profession in this country, the honorable position which Boston is entitled to hold for the encouragement she has always given to discoveries in medical science, the history of the medical department of the University, and the principles and purposes with which he enters on the duties of his office, — the whole written with a rare union of the pleasant and the dignified in style.



## INTELLIGENCE.

## RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Ecclesiastical Record.* — The ministerial changes within the last two months have been comparatively few. Rev. Frederic W. Holland, having accepted the appointment of Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, has resigned his pastoral connection with the church in Rochester, N. Y. Rev. Charles Briggs, we understand, will remain in the office of the Association, and attend to its local business. — Rev. Mr. Weiss of Watertown has accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the Unitarian church in New Bedford. — Rev. Mr. Barry, formerly of Framingham, has resumed the duties of the ministry, as pastor of the Second Unitarian church in Lowell, — a situation which he was on the point of occupying when ill health obliged him to relinquish all professional labor, and which restores him to the scene of his earliest ministry. — Rev. Mr. Huntington, late of Ashby, has taken the permanent charge of the congregation at Milwaukie, Wis. — Rev. Mr. Tenney has resigned his office as pastor of the society in Kennebunk, Me. — Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston has again declined an invitation from the church of the Messiah in the city of New York. — Rev. Mr. Angier of Milton will preach to the congregation in Bangor, Me., during the winter. — Rev. Mr. Palfrey, late of Barnstable, is preaching to the society in Belfast, Me., the arrangement with Mr. Rice, to which we referred in our last number, not having gone into effect. — Rev. Charles Brooks of Boston, on a recent visit to Vermont, preached several times in Montpelier, where we hope soon to hear that a Unitarian society has been formed.

We notice with pleasure the disposition of some of our congregations to repair or replace their time-worn sanctuaries. The South Congregational church in this city have, within the last year, raised the sum of \$10,000, partly for this purpose, but more especially for the liquidation of their debt. — The Twelfth Congregational church in this city have, also, given a new face to the interior of their house of worship. — The society in East Cambridge, over which Dr. Ingersoll has just been settled, have expended \$2000 in repairs of their meetinghouse. — The Unitarian society in Baltimore have not only renovated the interior of their beautiful church, but have made some important improvements in its construction, and have also paid off the debt with which they were encumbered. — The Unitarian meetinghouse in Athol has been repaired and remodelled. — The First Congregational society in Stow have suffered a severe loss in the destruction of their meetinghouse by fire, but propose at once to erect another in its place. — The Unitarian society in Barre are engaged in erecting a new meetinghouse. — The First Congregational parish in Brookline have decided to take down their present church, that they may build one better adapted for public speaking. — The Dedication services at the church of the Saviour and at the Indiana Street Congregational church, in this city, are noticed on another page. The former, from its situation as well as the solidity and style of its architecture, has been a costly structure, and is a con-

spicuous ornament of our metropolis, but, by the terms of the subscription, the larger part of the cost can never fall as a debt upon the society. The latter is a less expensive building, though the interior is particularly beautiful, and is designed to accommodate those persons who may be able to pay but a small annual assessment.

In our notice of the Autumnal Convention at Salem we remarked, that a "considerable number of ministers were present." A friend has informed us, that, by actual counting, he ascertained the number in attendance during the whole or different parts of the sessions to be one hundred and twenty-three.

---

*Memorial to Congress on the War.* — A meeting of Unitarians was held in the chapel in Bedford Street, Boston, on the 21st, and by adjournment on the 28th, of October, 1847, to consider what action they might take in reference to the present war with Mexico. Rev. Mr. Waterston of Boston was chosen Chairman, and Rev. Mr. Palfrey of Barnstable, Secretary. After some discussion, the following resolutions were passed : —

"*Resolved*, That it is expedient that Unitarians memorialize Congress against the continuance of the present war.

"*Resolved*, That, as Christian ministers, we are bound to, and do hereby, utter our deliberate condemnation of the war now existing between the United States and Mexico, and our solemn protest against its continuance.

"*Resolved*, That, in our opinion, it is the duty of Christians, without distinction of sect, to address memorials to Congress at the opening of their next session, urging the Representatives, Senators, and Executive of the United States at once to take the necessary steps for securing an immediate and permanent peace with Mexico, by withdrawing all troops of this nation from her territory, restoring to her possession the provinces which we now occupy, offering the amplest atonement in our power for the wrongs which we have inflicted, and appointing Commissioners empowered to adjust questions in dispute between these sister republics."

A committee of nine was appointed under the first of these votes, viz. Rev. Messrs. Stetson of Medford, Channing of Boston, Ware of Cambridge, Palfrey of Barnstable, Clarke and May of Boston, Francis of Cambridge, Stone of Salem, and Gannett of Boston; to whom were afterwards added seven laymen, viz. Messrs. J. P. Blanchard, L. G. Pray, G. G. Channing, C. Sumner, C. F. Adams, S. Fairbanks, and J. A. Andrew, of Boston. This committee have since prepared a memorial embodying the sentiment, and much of the language, of the last two resolutions, which has been sent to every Unitarian minister in the country, for circulation, in such manner as he may think proper, among his congregation.

---

*Periodical Journals.* — Rev. Nathaniel S. Folsom of Charlestown has taken the editorial charge of the *Christian Register*, still, however, performing his duties as a minister at large. — Rev. James F. Clarke of Boston has, also, without relinquishing his pastoral duties, assumed the editorship of the *Christian World*. — The *Christian Inquirer* of New York is now conducted by Rev. Mr. Bellows and Mrs. C. W. Kirkland. The subscription has been reduced to one dollar a year, at which price a very large circulation alone can defray the expense of publication. — The

*Massachusetts Quarterly Review* is the title of a new journal, the first number of which, if it have rather disappointed expectation, may only prepare us for a more agreeable disappointment in future. The names of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, and J. Elliot Cabot as editors are a sufficient assurance that it will not be dull or timid. Independent in its own way, strong of purpose, and sincere in expression, it will, we suppose, deal with politics, art, and religion, with individual and social life, with the tendencies and wants of the times, in a manner to disturb some sensibilities and offend some convictions. We do not expect to like all we shall find in its pages; but its honesty and its energy, we doubt not, will entitle it to commendation. — The *Harbinger*, the organ of the Associationists, has been removed to New York. The experiment at Brook Farm having been relinquished, Mr. Ripley has gone to New York to conduct the paper and take charge of the interests of the cause to which it is devoted in that city, securing also, by this removal, a more central position for the efforts with which he is connected.

---

*Great Britain and Ireland.* — Our readers are so well acquainted with the recent history of the relations existing between the Unitarians of the British Isles and of the United States, that we need not enter into details; nor do we wish to bear any part in perpetuating an unpleasant and needless state of feeling. The extreme earnestness of some of our English and Irish friends on the subject of slavery leads them to use language and adopt measures, the good effect of which we seriously question, while of the purity or kindness of their intentions we entertain no doubt. At the last annual meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, a warm discussion arose in consequence of a passage in the Report of the Committee, alluding in friendly terms to an invitation which had been sent from this city to our English brethren to attend our anniversary meetings. The invitation proceeded from a few individuals, but was unhappily supposed to have emanated from the American Unitarian Association, which had committed the offence of including a slaveholder in the number of its Vice-Presidents. The misconception of its origin was corrected, and the language of the Report was sustained by the vote of a large majority of the members of the British and Foreign Association. Since that meeting a reply to the letter of invitation has been in circulation in England and Scotland, and, having received the signature of fifty-four ministers and fourteen hundred and thirty laymen, has been recently transmitted to this country. If our pages were not crowded, even to the exclusion of domestic intelligence which we had prepared, we should insert this document; but its appearance in the weekly journals of our denomination has brought it before the eyes of all our readers. With "affectionate acknowledgments of our kindness, and all earnest desires to preserve and reciprocate it," the reply contains a fervent remonstrance on our imputed participation in the guilt of slaveholding.

The same want of space obliges us to omit the "Response to the Address of the Irish Unitarian Christian Society, from their Brethren in America," prepared by a committee appointed at a meeting held in Boston in May, 1846, consisting of Rev. Mr. Briggs of Plymouth, Rev. Mr. May of Leicester, J. A. Andrew, Esq., of Boston, Rev. Messrs. Clarke and Huntington of Boston, Rev. Mr. Peabody of Ports-

mouth, N. H., Rev. Mr. Osgood of Providence, R. I., and Rev. Mr. Holland of Rochester, N. Y. The Reply is written in terms of the closest sympathy with the Address which called it forth.

The English Unitarians are much interested at the present time in establishing a collegiate institution in London, under the title of University Hall, which shall offer to students the advantages of an academical residence in the metropolis, and shall furnish them with instruction in branches not taught in University College, particularly theology and mental and moral philosophy. A society has been formed and subscriptions taken for this object.

Rev. William Hincks, who, after resigning his professorship in Manchester College on its removal from York, established the *London Inquirer*, and edited it with marked ability for five years, preaching meanwhile to the congregation worshipping in the Stamford Street chapel, has relinquished his connection with the *Inquirer*, and is now in this country, where he will spend a year in travelling and occasional lecturing on Astronomy, and on Botany, which he has made a particular subject of study. The publication of the *Inquirer* is continued, though it does not appear under whose editorial charge.

The death of Rev. Mr. Johns of Liverpool is an event suited to awaken emotions of mingled sorrow and admiration. Mr. Johns had for ten years been the faithful minister to the poor in that city, and contracted the fever which occasioned his death in his attendance on the destitute sick whom he sought in their wretched and pestilential abodes. He was a man of poetic temperament and fine powers of mind, but devoted himself with unwearied zeal to the labors of his ministry, and has earned the meed of a true Christian martyrdom.

---

*Dedications.* — The "Church of the Saviour" in BOSTON, Mass., was dedicated November 10, 1847. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Waterston, the pastor, from 1 Corinthians iii. 11; the Dedication Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Parkman, Huntington, and Lothrop, of Boston, and Rev. Dr. Pierce of Brookline.

The Indiana Street Congregational Church in BOSTON, Mass., was dedicated December 12, 1847. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Fox, the pastor, from Ezekiel xiv. 3; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. Lothrop of Boston; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Huntington, Peabody, Barnard, and Parkman, of Boston.

The meetinghouse erected by the First Congregational Society in FRAMINGHAM, Mass., in place of their former house of worship, was dedicated December 1, 1847. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston, from 2 Corinthians v. 18; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. Allen of Northboro'; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Bulfinch of Nashua, N. H., Ware of Cambridge, Sanger of Dover, and Muzzey of Cambridge.

---

*Installation.* — REV. GEORGE GOLDTHWAIT INGERSOLL, D. D., formerly of Burlington, Vt., was installed as pastor of the Third Congregational Church in CAMBRIDGE (East Cambridge), Mass., December 5, 1847. The services were conducted by the Unitarian ministers of Cam-



bridge, without the organization of a council. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Newell, from 1 Timothy ii. 3-7; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Dr. Walker; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Ware and Muzzey.

#### OBITUARY.

HON. ALEXANDER HILL EVERETT died at Canton, in China, May 29, 1847, aged 56 years.

Mr. Everett was born in Boston, the second son of Rev. Oliver Everett, then minister of the church in Church Green. He graduated at Cambridge in 1806, and not long after began the study of the law, under the direction of Hon. John Quincy Adams. When Mr. Adams went to Russia, as our Minister to that country, Mr. Everett accompanied him as his secretary, being at that time not quite twenty years old. This initiation into diplomatic pursuits was followed by a life devoted more constantly to similar occupations than to those of his first chosen profession. In 1815, he again went to Europe, as Secretary of our Legation at the Court of the King of the Netherlands. In 1817 he returned to America, but in 1818 embarked again for Holland, having been appointed *Chargé d'Affaires*. In 1825, he accepted the position of Ambassador at the Court of Madrid, where he remained till 1829.

For many years after his return to America, he conducted the *North American Review*, to which he had contributed constantly for a long period. Besides some public business in Cuba, and his duties in our own legislature, his principal public services after his return from Europe were rendered in Louisiana, in 1842, '43, and '44, as President of Jefferson College, an institution endowed and sustained by the State of Louisiana, and in China as Commissioner from our government to the government of that empire. The nomination to this office took him wholly by surprise; but he finally accepted it, and entered on the studies necessary for its discharge with great pleasure and alacrity. His early acquaintance with Oriental literature, his constant interest in the institutions of China, and his carefully acquired knowledge of European society and political institutions, with his exquisite habits of observation, gave us reason to hope that his residence in that country would throw new light on many points of its manners and policy. During his residence in China, he applied himself with great zeal to his diplomatic duties, and to the study of affairs around him; but his strength was constantly yielding under the painful disease, before which his earthly life at last gave way.

Mr. Everett looked forward to his death with a perfect consciousness of its steady approach, and without fear or anxiety. His warm religious principle, always high and strong, had such control of him, that he was neither crushed by the agony of long and increasing disease, nor alarmed at the announcement of its coming end. He was of philosophical habits of study and reflection, and his religious principles had through his life been single and clear; refuting utterly the insinuation, that philosophical study weakens, or deadens, the growth of religious sentiments and convictions. He was a careful metaphysician, and his study of the human mind made all the clearer to him its relations to God and eternity. His religious faith was, undoubtedly, directed by

the habits of thought and the convictions thus gained. Such convictions, probably, led him to the views of religion in which he always lived, as directly as elaborate rational criticism of the Bible led other men, who surrounded him, to similar views. All his writings, as well as his frequent conversation, are the evidence that this faith, while simple and reasonable, was pure, and high, and kind. It was wholly unlimited by the formal creeds of other men,—as he certainly did not fear to find his own ways of pleasing God. It led him to his diligence in study, to his unbending principle, and to that kindness of heart, and action, and motive, with which he hoped he could train himself for heaven, and which so distinguished him, and so endeared him to those he has left behind. And it always displayed itself in his demeanour, in his advice to younger men, and in his sedulous interest in the established ordinances of religion. He was catholic in his sympathies with men of other religious opinions from his own. He met Christians of any name kindly and heartily. He was himself a member of the church in Brattle Street, Boston, and, when opportunity permitted, a constant attendant on Unitarian places of worship, to which his religious convictions and sympathies directly conducted him.

Besides his numerous contributions to periodicals, a few of which only have been collected, Mr. Everett's principal published works are "Europe," a treatise on the political condition of Europe in 1821, published in 1822, 8vo.,—"America," a similar treatise published in 1825, 8vo.,—"New Ideas on Population," suggested by, and a reply to, Malthus and his school, 1827. Two volumes of his Essays have been published; and he had prepared for a continuation of the series.

H—e.

---

EZRA GREEN, M. D., died at Dover, N. H., July 25, 1847, aged 101 years and 27 days.

Johnson fixes upon a century "as the test of literary merit." The book that survives a hundred years, and after it has lost all the advantages it once derived from personal allusions, local customs, and temporary opinions, continues to be read with pleasure and improvement, must have substantial and intrinsic worth. We might almost apply the same test to life and character. We certainly feel that an earthly pilgrimage which has reached to a century must have something extraordinary in it, that the life which has been so prolonged must have been in singular conformity with the physical and moral laws of God. We feel an interest in ascertaining something of the character and habits of one who has so far exceeded the usual age of man, and find it difficult to resist the conviction that there was in them that which largely contributed to this result. We cannot undertake, in the present case, to gratify this curiosity, but we desire to preserve in our journal some brief but permanent record of one who had much to make him worthy of remembrance and honor, besides "length of years."

Ezra Green was born at Malden, Mass., June 17 (Old Style), 1747. He was graduated at Cambridge, in 1765, studied medicine with Dr. Sprague of Malden, and commenced the practice of his profession at Dover, N. H., about 1769. Here he became intimately acquainted with the Rev. Dr. Belknap, then pastor of the First Congregational Church at Dover. He cherished a profound veneration for the memory

of that distinguished scholar and divine, and often acknowledged the beneficial influence he exerted in the formation of his character and opinions when a young man. Immediately after the battle of Bunker's Hill, he joined the American army as a surgeon, and for several years during the Revolutionary war he served in that capacity, both on the land and on the sea. He resigned his commission in the navy in the autumn of 1781, and, returning to Dover, relinquished the practice of his profession and engaged in commercial pursuits. The remainder of his life was uneventful but useful, marked even to the last by a ready sympathy in all that related to the public good, and a prompt fidelity in meeting all his responsibilities as a man, a citizen, and a Christian. He early became a member of the First Congregational church in Dover, and in 1790 was chosen deacon, and held the office for many years. Chauncey's "Dissertations" and Worcester's "Bible News" led him to adopt liberal and Unitarian opinions in theology, in the profession of which he was always zealous and consistent. Although then more than eighty years old, he took an active part in the formation of the First Unitarian society in Dover, in 1827, and rejoiced heartily in its growth and prosperity. In politics he was a Federalist, and as a member of the New Hampshire State Convention he voted in favor of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. The prominent feature in his character was a moral independence and integrity that led him to do and say what he thought right, and then meet the event with a calm and undisturbed mind. It was this that prompted him to say to Paul Jones, on the quarter-deck of the *Ranger*, that "he regarded the descent made upon the Earl of Selkirk's property as a piratical expedition." This moral independence and integrity accompanied him through life, making him firm, honest, consistent, and producing that equable frame of mind which tended to prolong his years. He died in the full possession of his faculties, leaving an honored name and memory. L—p.

---

REV. JAMES KAY died at Trout Run, Penn., September 22, 1847, aged 70 years.

This faithful Christian pastor, whose last twenty-five years were spent in the ministry at Northumberland, Penn., was born at Heap Fold (the name of his paternal mansion), near Bury, in Lancashire, June 21, 1777. He was the only son of a widowed mother, whose circumstances were happily such as enabled her to give her son an education qualifying him for mercantile pursuits, and, at her death, to leave him and her only daughter an annuity sufficient to secure them from dependence. He was brought up in the Established Church; but, at the age of seventeen, the simpler forms of the Dissenters so attracted and impressed him that he turned his attention to theological studies, and sought to prepare himself for the sacred office of a Christian teacher at a Dissenting college, somewhat against his mother's wishes. The late Mr. Little, whose memory is still affectionately cherished in the Unitarian church at Washington, where he so faithfully ministered, was a fellow-student with Mr. Kay in the same college.

In 1799, Mr. Kay was settled over a Calvinistic congregation in Kendal, Westmoreland, and retained that situation for a period of ten years. In 1809, while engaged in the delivery of a course of lectures on the Epistles, doubts of the soundness of the Calvinistic form of faith began



to disturb his mind. That one, educated, as Mr. Kay had been, in Orthodox Christianity, found occasion of doubt in the study of the Epistles shows both his love of truth, and the simplicity of the Gospel, which even the confessed obscurities of those portions of the New Testament could not hide. In 1810, after a severe struggle with his old faith, he resigned the pulpit consecrated as the first scene of his ministerial duty. He was followed by about one third of his flock. A large hall was hired and fitted up for religious worship. As his means were diminished, and he had a wife and children to provide for, he took charge of a number of boys, thus adding to the care of the pulpit the daily labor of teaching. He continued thus to labor, preaching three times every Lord's day for seven years, at the termination of which period, as his health was giving way, he resigned his pastoral charge and his class of boys, and removed with his wife and eight children to Heap Fold, with the resolution of giving up preaching altogether, and devoting himself to agricultural pursuits. But for this mode of life he was in no way fitted, nor could he cease to feel interested in the cause of Christian truth. After a residence of two years on the spot of his nativity, he accepted an invitation to take charge of a Unitarian congregation in Hindley, Lancashire. Here he was comfortably situated. To the time passed in this place he looked back as the brightest and pleasantest. Here he would probably have remained to the end of his life, had not the claims of his children pressed powerfully on his thoughts. The inspiring prospect disclosed to him across the Atlantic attracted his heart, and for the sake of free room and all the helps to growth and progress which this country offered for his sons, he resolved to transfer his home to America. His flock parted with him with great reluctance, and for more than a year after his departure kept their pulpit vacant, cherishing a confident hope that they should see his face again.

In company with seven other families, all forming one friendly circle, Mr. Kay, with his wife and nine children, arrived in this country in June, 1821, bringing with him property sufficient to insure to persons of simple tastes and habits a comfortable independence. After a few months spent in Philadelphia, leaving his family behind him, he went westward in search of a home for them. Deviating from his proposed course for the sake of paying the tribute of his respect at the grave of Priestley, he sought Northumberland where those honored ashes lie. There he was persuaded to remain, and the spot was soon invested to his mind with all the associations of home. The intermittent fever of that region, the only objection to the choice he had made, severely tried his by no means rugged constitution. He lived, notwithstanding, to a good old age. Yet the wasting attacks of the climate occasioned him seasons of debility, which loosened his hold on life, and combined with his faith and his hopes to fix his regards above and beyond the present. He was disabled also by his impaired health for a continuance of those zealous exertions in the cause of Liberal Christianity which his earlier years had witnessed. Still, as his strength would permit, he discharged the offices of a Christian pastor, and endeared himself to the little flock there gathered, and to the whole neighbourhood. At his far-off post he watched the progress of opinion in our denomination with deep interest, and sometimes with an alarm which he lived to believe, and was happy to confess, was groundless. He was glad to de-



clare his conviction that the household of faith to which he belonged was growing in the spirit and fruits of Christian truth. His deportment in his family and towards all persons was marked by great benignity. He abounded in that wisdom which is, first and last, gentle. His continued ill-health kept the approaching hour of his departure always before him ; and although his death was caused by a sudden and violent attack of disease, during a temporary absence from home, yet he was not taken by surprise. He fell asleep with the accents of a devout faith on his lips, and, we doubt not, with the trustful spirit of a disciple in his heart. No one who saw Mr. Kay in his later years, when time had silvered his few thin locks, will soon forget the benign beauty of his old age. His personal appearance was altogether winning and venerable. Of eleven children, eight survive to cherish, with their mother, the faithful sharer of all their father's cares, his blameless and honored memory.

F.

---

HON. ARTEMAS WARD, LL. D., died in Boston, October 7, 1847, aged 85 years.

Judge Ward was the son of General Ward, whose name is connected with the early period of the American Revolution. He was born at Shrewsbury, Mass., in 1762, and graduated at Harvard College in 1783. Having completed his professional studies, he opened an office at Weston, in 1786. In 1801, in consequence of the removal of his brother-in-law, the late Samuel Dexter, to Washington, he transferred his residence to Charlestown, whence, in 1809, he removed to Boston. In both places he had a very extensive practice, and his methodical habits and untiring industry enabled him to perform a vast amount of professional labor with apparent ease. He was also much in public life, as Representative, Counsellor, and Senator in the government of his native State, and from 1812 to 1817 Representative in Congress from the county of Suffolk. In 1819, he became Judge of the Boston Court of Common Pleas, and in 1820 Chief Justice of the Circuit Court of Common Pleas for the Commonwealth, then recently organized. This office he resigned in 1839 ; and from a long course of professional and public duties, all successfully and honorably discharged, retired to pass the remainder of his days in the seclusion of private life. We cannot here speak as we would of his many excellent qualities of intellect and heart, which laid the foundation of his eminent usefulness and success in life, and secured for him an endeared and venerated memory. High above all stood a deep and unconquerable love of justice, a reverence for truth and right. This marked all his transactions of business ; as a lawyer it raised him above all pettifogging and chicanery, which he held in special abhorrence ; while as a judge it led him to be patient and faithful, and especially careful to dismiss no cause without an impartial and thorough hearing. No one ever took to the bench a deeper feeling of responsibility, or left it with a purer name. The tribute which the tidings of his death called forth from the Suffolk bar bears testimony to the sense entertained of his courtesy and kindness, as well as of the higher qualities of integrity and love of right, by those best entitled to speak of his judicial merits. His strictness and elevation of principle, his unstained life, the simplicity of his habits, his Christian faith, his reverential piety, and filial trust in a wise and paternal Provi-

dence, which sustained him under painful infirmities of body, and afforded peace and serenity in the closing scene, all combined to stamp on his character features of great dignity and worth. L.

---

REV. DANIEL M. STEARNS died at Lincoln, Mass., October 19, 1847, aged 54 years.

Mr. Stearns was the youngest son of the late Rev. Charles Stearns, D. D., for many years the minister of the Congregational Society in Lincoln. He passed his youth at home, under the guidance and instruction of his father, whose limited pecuniary means prevented him from giving his son so early a collegiate education as he desired. Daniel devoted several years to labor on the farm, sometimes teaching school in the winter, until, prepared by his father, he was admitted to the Sophomore class in Brown University, and was graduated September 16, 1822. He then returned to Lincoln, and pursued his studies with reference to the ministry with his father, teaching school a part of the time, and received approbation to preach from the Cambridge Association. In the summer of 1827, he went to Dennis, on Cape Cod, to preach as a candidate, and was ordained as pastor of the Congregational church and society in that place, May 14, 1828. He faithfully and acceptably discharged the duties of the ministry there, under many trials and discouragements, until March, 1839, when his pastoral relation was dissolved at his own request; though he continued to supply the pulpit several months afterwards. He preached for a few months in other places, but not with reference to a settlement, and soon returned with his family to "dwell among his own people," where he quietly and honorably passed the remainder of his life.

Mr. Stearns was chosen by his fellow-townsmen to represent them in the legislature of Massachusetts for the years 1841 and 1842; for they had confidence in his integrity and moral principle, as well as in his intelligence, as a politician. He was no idler, as is too often the case with those who leave professional pursuits, but devoted himself to agriculture, and labored daily in support of his family, often beyond his strength, not being favored with a strong and vigorous constitution. In 1842, the Unitarian Congregational society was formed in Lincoln, of which Mr. Stearns was an active and valued member, and was chosen one of the deacons of the church, the duties of which office he faithfully and meekly performed. He officiated several years as superintendent of the Sunday school, and took a lively interest in every thing connected with the welfare of the church and the spread of Liberal Christianity.

As a man, Mr. Stearns was remarkably amiable, prudent, and upright, and was highly esteemed by his neighbours and townsmen. As a Christian, he was sincere and devoted. His theological opinions were decidedly Unitarian. To every thing exclusive and bigoted, to Orthodox creeds and dogmas, he was always opposed. But he was charitable towards those who differed from him in sentiment, while firm in the maintenance of his own more liberal views of Christianity. The temper he displayed under trial, disappointment, and sickness proved the strength of his faith in God his Father, and the comfort of his hope as a disciple of Jesus Christ; in which faith and hope he calmly resigned his spirit into the hands of his Heavenly Father. R.